arXiv:1304.5144v1 [math.GR] 18 Apr 2013

Locally normal subgroups of totally disconnected groups.

Part I: General theory

Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace[*][1], Colin D. Reid[†][2], and George A. Willis[‡][2]

[1]Université catholique de Louvain, IRMP, Chemin du Cyclotron 2,
bte L7.01.02, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique
[2]School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University of
Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

April 19, 2013

Abstract

Let G be a totally disconnected, locally compact group. A **locally normal** subgroup of G is a compact subgroup whose normaliser is open. We begin an investigation of the structure of the family of locally normal subgroups of G. Modulo commensurability, this family forms a modular lattice $\mathcal{LN}(G)$, called the **structure lattice** of G. We show that G admits a canonical maximal quotient H for which the quasi-centre and the abelian locally normal subgroups are trivial. In this situation $\mathcal{LN}(H)$ has a canonical subset called the **centraliser lattice**, forming a Boolean algebra whose elements correspond to centralisers of locally normal subgroups. If H acts faithfully on its centraliser lattice, we show that the topology of H is determined by its algebraic structure (and thus invariant by every abstract group automomorphism), and also that the action on the Stone space of the centraliser lattice is universal for a class of actions on profinite spaces.

---

[*] F.R.S.-FNRS research associate, supported in part by the ERC (grant #278469)

[†] Supported in part by ARC Discovery Project DP120100996

[‡] Supported in part by ARC Discovery Project DP0984342

Contents

1 Introduction **3**

2 Locally normal subgroups **7**
2.1 Definition and first properties . . . 7
2.2 Local equivalence and the structure lattice . . . 8

3 Quasi-centralisers and their stability properties **11**
3.1 The quasi-centre . . . 11
3.2 Quasi-centralisers . . . 12
3.3 C-stability . . . 14
3.4 Local C-stability . . . 17

4 Direct decomposition of locally normal subgroups **19**
4.1 Local decomposition lattices . . . 19
4.2 Locally finitely decomposable t.d.l.c. groups . . . 22

5 The centraliser lattice and weakly branch actions **25**
5.1 The centraliser lattice . . . 25
5.2 Weakly branch actions . . . 28
5.3 A condition ensuring trivial rigid stabilisers . . . 32

6 Some radicals of locally compact groups **33**
6.1 The quasi-hypercentre . . . 33
6.2 Relation with the quasi-hypercentre of subgroups . . . 35
6.3 Other radicals . . . 38

7 Refinements of the group topology **44**
7.1 The structure lattice and refinements of the group topology . . . 44
7.2 Subgroups abstractly generated by locally normal subgroups . . . 48

8 Some remarks on groups with commensurated subgroups **51**

Bibliography **53**

1 Introduction

The aim of the present article, the first in a series, is to introduce some canonical objects of a local nature for studying the structure of non-discrete totally disconnected locally compact (t.d.l.c.) groups in general. Our appraoch was inspired by earlier work of J. Wilson [16] on just-infinite groups, and by Barnea–Ershov–Weigel [1] on abstract commensurators of profinite groups. While this article concerns general t.d.l.c. groups, the second paper in the series [5] will specialise the tools developed here to the study of compactly generated t.d.l.c. groups G with few normal subgroups, and in particular those that are topologically simple.

1.1 Background

Since the solution of Hilbert's fifth problem by Gleason, Montgomery–Zippin and Yamabe, connected locally compact groups are known to be subjected to a far-reaching structure theory, ensuring notably that they are all projective limits of connected Lie groups. This deep result extends the realm of Lie theory to all connected locally compact groups, thereby yielding a powerful machinery allowing for decomposition theorems and classification results.

Since disconnected locally compact groups include all discrete groups, and hence all groups, it was believed for a long time that no meaningful structure theory could be developed beyond the connected or almost connected case. In fact, in the most extreme situation when the connected component of each element is a singleton — the group is then called **totally disconnected** —, for a long time the main known result was van Dantzig's theorem, which asserts that compact open subgroups exist and form a basis of identity neighbourhoods. While a rather rich and deep theory was developed for some special classes of t.d.l.c. groups (profinite groups, reductive groups over local fields, p-adic analytic groups, . . .), the most general case remained notoriously intractable.

The situation changed in the mid 1990's, when G.Willis [15] opened a new perspective in the study of t.d.l.c. groups by introducing the **scale function**, which measures the translation length of elements acting by conjugation on the set of compact open subgroups, endowed with a suitable metric. Results obtained in that direction show a strikingly high level of generality; they provide detailed information on individual elements of a t.d.l.c. group G, and on some subgroups that are naturally associated to them (tidy subgroups, contraction groups, parabolic subgroups, etc.).

A complementary approach was initiated by Barnea–Ershov–Weigel [1], based on the following observation. Since any two compact open subgroups of a t.d.l.c. group are commensurate, any such group admits a natural homomorphism to the group of abstract commensurators of its compact open subgroups. By definition, this group of abstract commensurators can be recovered from any compact open subgroup, and is thus a purely local object, depending only on arbitrarily small identity neighbourhoods of the ambient t.d.l.c. group. This point of view thus pertains to a **local approach** of t.d.l.c. groups. Note however that there are only very few profinite groups whose group of abstract commensurators has been explicitly computed.

1.2 Locally normal subgroups and their centralisers

The central concept in the present work is that of a **locally normal** subgroup of a t.d.l.c. group, that is, a compact subgroup whose normaliser is open. A major part of [1] focuses on t.d.l.c. groups in which every open compact subgroup is (hereditarily) just infinite; this corresponds exactly to the condition that every non-trivial locally normal subgroup is open. As soon as we move away from this case, the arrangement of locally normal subgroups becomes more complex.

The intersection of two locally normal subgroups is locally normal. Moreover, if H and K are locally normal subgroups of G, then they admit closed subgroups of finite index $H' < H$ and $K' < K$ which normalise each other, and such that the product $H' \cdot K'$, which is a compact subgroup, is locally normal. It is thus natural to consider the collection of all locally normal subgroups modulo the equivalence relation given by **commensuration**: two subgroups H and K are **commensurate** if their intersection $H \cap K$ has finite index in both H and K. In this way, the collection of all equivalence classes of locally normal subgroups of G, which is denoted by $\mathcal{LN}(G)$, endowed with the partial ordering induced by the inclusion of subgroups, is easily seen to form a modular lattice. We call it the **structure lattice** of G. There are two elements that we regard as trivial (assuming G is non-discrete): the minimal element, denoted 0, which is the class of the trivial subgroup, and the maximal element, denoted ∞, which is the class of compact open subgroups. A non-trivial subset of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ is one that contains elements other than 0 and ∞.

We emphasise that the structure lattice is a *local* invariant of an arbitrary t.d.l.c. group G, since it is determined by any open compact subgroup, which admits a natural action of the whole of G, or indeed any by conjugation. A central idea in this work is that, although it is very difficult to determine explicitly what the structure lattice of a particular t.d.l.c. group G, the action of G on $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ may nevertheless be studied and provides an important tool in elucidating the overall structure of G. Moreover, under the right conditions we obtain two natural G-invariant subsets of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ that are Boolean algebras when equipped with the induced order; whenever non-trivial, those constitute valuable additional tools. The first is the **local decomposition lattice** $\mathcal{LD}(G)$, which consists of all direct factors of open compact subgroups of G up to equivalence. The second is the **centraliser lattice** $\mathcal{LC}(G)$: an element of $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ is given by the equivalence class of $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$ for some open compact subgroup U of G and closed normal subgroup K of U.

Following Burger–Mozes [3], we define the **quasi-centre** $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$ of a locally compact group G to be the collection of all elements whose centraliser is open (see Lemma 3.2 below for its basic properties).

Theorem I. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group.*

(i) (See Theorem 4.5]) *Suppose that G has trivial quasi-centre. Then $\mathcal{LD}(G)$ is a Boolean algebra.*

(ii) (See Theorem 5.2]) *Suppose in addition that G has no non-trivial abelian locally normal subgroups. Then $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ is a Boolean algebra and $\mathcal{LD}(G)$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{LC}(G)$.*

This opens up a new perspective: using the Stone representation theorem, a group action on a Boolean algebra $\mathcal{A}$ can equivalently be regarded as a group action by homeomorphisms on a topological space $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ that is **profinite**, in other words, compact and totally disconnected. In order to describe the properties of the G-action on the Stone space of its centraliser or local decomposition lattice, we need to introduce the following definition. Let G be a locally compact group and $\mathfrak{X}$ be a profinite space on which G acts faithfully by homeomorphisms. The G-action is called **weakly branch** if for every non-empty clopen subset $\alpha \subsetneq \mathfrak{X}$, the stabiliser of α in G is open, and the pointwise stabiliser of α is non-trivial.

Theorem II (See Theorem 5.11)**.** *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group. Suppose* $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ *and that G has no non-trivial abelian locally normal subgroup.*

(i) Suppose G acts faithfully on $\mathcal{LC}(G)$. Then the induced action of G on $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{LC}(G))$ is a faithful weakly branch action.

(ii) Suppose $\mathfrak{X}$ is a profinite space with a faithful weakly branch action of G. Then there exists a G-equivariant surjective map from $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{LC}(G))$ to $\mathfrak{X}$.

In particular, if G acts faithfully on $\mathcal{LC}(G)$, then the G-space $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{LC}(G))$ is the unique maximal compact G-space endowed with a faithful weakly branch action.

1.3 Radical theory

The hypotheses of Theorem I can be motivated by the fact that they are satisfied by all compactly generated, topologically simple t.d.l.c. groups: for (i) this is Theorem 4.8 of [1], and for (ii) this will be proved in [5, Theorem A]. Moreover, we will show in the present article that an *arbitrary* t.d.l.c. group always has a canonical maximal quotient which satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem I(i) or (ii). This will be obtained by developing a suitable 'radical theory'.

Theorem III. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group.*

Then G admits closed characteristic subgroups $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) \leq \mathrm{R}_{[\mathrm{A}]}(G) \leq G$ enjoying the following properties:

(i) (See Theorem 6.2) $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$ *is the unique smallest closed normal subgroup N of G such that G/N has trivial quasi-centre.*

(ii) (See Theorem 6.10) $\mathrm{R}_{[\mathrm{A}]}(G)$ *is the unique smallest closed normal subgroup M of G such that G/M has trivial quasi-centre and no non-trivial abelian locally normal subgroup.*

Both $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$ and $\mathrm{R}_{[\mathrm{A}]}(G)$ are well-behaved with respect to open subgroups, in the sense that $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H) = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) \cap H$ and $\mathrm{R}_{[\mathrm{A}]}(H) = \mathrm{R}_{[\mathrm{A}]}(G) \cap H$ for any open subgroup H of G (see Propositions 6.3 and 6.14). Thus if the canonical quotients provided by Theorem III turn out to be trivial, we have some additional local information about the structure of G and can investigate the group by alternative means. For instance it is easily seen that if $\mathrm{R}_{[\mathrm{A}]}(G) = G$, then the open compact subgroups of G are Fitting-regular in the sense of [13].

1.4 Group topologies

We now specialise to the case of first-countable t.d.l.c. groups. In this situation we obtain some results on the relationship between the commensurated compact subgroups and the locally normal subgroups; amongst other things it is shown (Lemma 7.4) that a closed subgroup K of a first-countable profinite group U is commensurated by U if and only if U normalises an open subgroup of K. In particular, in an arbitrary t.d.l.c. group G, any compact commensurated subgroup is commensurate with a locally normal subbgroup, whose commensurability class is thus a G-fixed point in the structure lattice $\mathcal{LN}(G)$. As a consequence, the commensurated locally normal subgroups have an interpretation in terms of group topologies.

Theorem IV (See § 7.1)**.** *Let G be a first-countable t.d.l.c. group. Then there is a natural bijection between the elements of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ that are fixed by the action of G, and refinements of the topology of G that are locally compact and compatible with the group structure.*

In the case that G satisfies one of the hypotheses of Theorem I and additionally acts faithfully on the associated Boolean algebra, we obtain a topological rigidity result (of a similar kind to results for semisimple Lie groups over real and p-adic fields given in [10] and [12]).

Theorem V (See Theorem 7.5)**.** *Let G be a second-countable t.d.l.c. group with trivial quasi-centre. Make one of the following hypotheses:*

(a) G acts faithfully on $\mathcal{LD}(G)$.

(b) G has no non-trivial abelian locally normal subgroups and G acts faithfully on $\mathcal{LC}(G)$.

Then the topology of G is the coarsest group topology on G that forms a Baire space. In particular, it is preserved by every automorphism of G as an abstract group.

Consequently, the topology of G is the unique σ-compact locally compact group topology on G, and the set of all locally compact group topologies of G is in natural bijection with the set of fixed points of G acting on $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ by conjugation.

2 Locally normal subgroups

2.1 Definition and first properties

Let G be a t.d.l.c. group. Write $\mathcal{B}(G)$ for the set of open compact subgroups of G; note that by van Dantzig's theorem, $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a base of identity neighbourhoods, and by elementary topology, any two elements of $\mathcal{B}(G)$ are commensurate.

A **locally normal** subgroup of G is a compact subgroup H such that $\mathrm{N}_G(H)$ is open. Equivalently, a subgroup of G is locally normal if and only if it is compact and normalised by some compact open subgroup. The most elementary properties of locally normal subgroups collected in the following will frequently be used without comment.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and K, L be subgroups of G.*

(i) If K and L are locally normal, so is $K \cap L$.

(ii) If K is locally normal, so is every open subgroup of K.

(iii) If K is locally normal, so is $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$ for any $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$.

(iv) If K is locally normal, then there is some $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ containing K as a normal subgroup.

Proof. (i) is clear since $K \cap L$ is normalised by $\mathrm{N}_G(K) \cap \mathrm{N}_G(L)$.

(ii) An open subgroup of K may written as $K \cap U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. Part (ii) follows from (i) since any element of $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is locally normal.

(iii) Let $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. If K is locally normal, then $\mathrm{N}_U(K) = U \cap \mathrm{N}_G(K)$ is open. Since $\mathrm{N}_U(K)$ normalises $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$, it follows that $\mathrm{N}_G(\mathrm{C}_U(K))$ is open. Since $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$ is clearly compact, it is thus locally normal, as claimed.

(iv) If K is locally normal, then it is normalised by some $V \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. The group $U = KV$ is then a compact open subgroup of G containing K as a normal subgroup. $\square$

Notice that the converse to Lemma 2.1(ii) does not hold in general: namely, the fact that K is compact and contains a locally normal subgroup as an open subgroup does generally not imply that K itself is locally normal, since otherwise all finite subgroups of G would be locally normal, hence contained in the quasi-centre $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$.

2.2 Local equivalence and the structure lattice

Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and $H \leq G$ be a subgroup. Write $[H]$ for the class of all subgroups K of G such that $K \cap U = H \cap U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. Say H and K are **locally equivalent** if $[H] = [K]$. There is a natural partial ordering on local equivalence classes, given by $[H] \geq [K]$ if $H \cap K \cap U = K \cap U$ for some $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$.

Note that two compact subgroups of G are locally equivalent if and only if they are commensurate.

A subgroup H in G is locally equivalent to the trivial subgroup if and only if H is discrete. We shall later be interested in subgroups H such that $H \cap U = 1$ for all $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. Since every compact (and hence every finite) subgroup of G is contained in some open compact subgroup, the latter property holds if and only if H is discrete and torsion-free.

Let $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ be the set of local equivalence classes of subgroups of G that have locally normal representatives. Unless otherwise stated, when choosing a representative of $\alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$, we only take representatives that are locally normal. Given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$, let U be an open compact subgroup of G such that there exist $H \in \alpha$ and $K \in \beta$ such that $H, K \trianglelefteq U$. Define $\wedge$ and $\vee$ as follows:

$$\alpha \wedge \beta = [H \cap K]; \ \alpha \vee \beta = [HK].$$

Note that $\alpha \wedge \beta$ and $\alpha \vee \beta$ do not depend on the choice of H, K or U; it is also clear that $\alpha \wedge \beta$ and $\alpha \vee \beta$ are respectively the greatest lower bound and least upper bound of α and β. Thus the operations $\wedge$ and $\vee$ endow $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ the structure of a lattice, which we call the **structure lattice** of G.

Example 2.2. Let T be a regular tree of finite degree d, with $d \geq 3$, and let $G = \mathrm{Aut}(T)$. Then G is a t.d.l.c. group, with topology generated by the pointwise stabilisers of finite subtrees of T. Let F be a finite subtree of T, let U be the pointwise stabiliser of F, and let $T_1, \dots, T_n$ be the connected components of $T - F$. Then U decomposes as a direct product

$$U = K_1 \times K_2 \times \dots \times K_n$$

where K_i is the pointwise stabiliser in G of all vertices outside T_i. Evidently K_i is compact and normal in U, so it is locally normal in G, and since each tree T_i is infinite and G induces an infinite group of automorphisms on it, each group K_i is infinite. Thus the given decomposition of U provides 2^n distinct elements of the structure lattice of G. By varying the finite tree F, we see that $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ is infinite in this case.

Example 2.3. Let $G = \mathbf{Q}_p^n$ for $n \geq 2$. Then the locally normal subgroups of G are just the compact subgroups, since G is abelian. These are all of the form $\mathbf{Z}_p^m$ for $0 \leq m \leq n$. It is easily seen that two compact subgroups of G are commensurate if and only if they span the same subspace of G regarded as a $\mathbf{Q}_p$-vector space, and conversely every $\mathbf{Q}_p$-subspace of G is spanned by a compact subgroup. Consequently, the structure lattice of G is naturally isomorphic to the lattice of $\mathbf{Q}_p$-subspaces of G. In particular, $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ is uncountable.

Example 2.4. At the other extreme, let G be any t.d.l.c. group with a hereditarily just infinite open subgroup U, for instance $G = \mathbf{Q}_p$ or $G = \mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbf{Q}_p)$. Then given a locally normal subgroup K, the intersection $K \cap U$ is normal in an open subgroup of U, and hence K is either finite or open. Hence $\mathcal{LN}(G) = \{0, \infty\}$.

We see that the lattice structure is preserved by the topological automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ of G; in particular, G acts on $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ by conjugation. If G is not discrete, there are two 'trivial' elements of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$, namely the class of the trivial group, which we will denote 0, and the class of the open compact subgroups, which we will denote ∞. More generally the symbols 0 and ∞ will be used to denote the minimum and maximum elements respectively of a bounded lattice. When discussing subsets of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$, we will regard a subset as non-trivial if it contains an element other than 0 and ∞.

The use of the term *structure lattice* is borrowed from J. Wilson ([16]), who used similar ideas in the context of just infinite groups. In a subsequent paper, we will discuss groups that are locally just infinite, incorporating the key results from [16] into the theory being developed in the present paper.

The structure lattice is a purely 'local' invariant of a t.d.l.c. group, that is, it is completely determined by any open compact subgroup. It is also built out of lattices of normal subgroups of open compact subgroups in a natural sense.

Lemma 2.5. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group.*

(i) Let X be a finite subset of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the sublattice generated by X. Then there is an open compact subgroup U and a choice of representatives Y for the elements of X, so that every element of Y is a normal subgroup of U, and $\mathcal{L}$ is isomorphic to the lattice of subgroups of U generated by Y modulo commensuration.

(ii) Let I be a lattice identity that is satisfied by the normal subgroup lattice of U (modulo commensuration), for every open compact subgroup U of G. Then I is satisfied by $\mathcal{LN}(G)$. In particular, $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ is a modular lattice.

Proof. (i) Let $X = \{[K_1], \dots, [K_n]\}$, let U be an open compact subgroup of $\bigcap \mathrm{N}_G(K_i)$, and let $L_i = U \cap K_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then $Y = \{L_1, \dots, L_n\}$ consists of normal subgroups of U, and the meet and join operations in $\mathcal{L}$ can evidently be given by $[K_i] \wedge [K_j] = [L_i \cap L_j]$ and $[K_i] \vee [K_j] = [L_i L_j] = [\langle L_i, L_j \rangle]$. Thus the map $L \mapsto [L]$ gives a surjective map from the lattice generated by Y to $\mathcal{L}$, and two subgroups have the same image if and only if they have an open subgroup in common.

(ii) This is immediate from (i), recalling that the lattice of normal subgroups in any group is modular (see [7, Theorem 8.3]). ☐

3 Quasi-centralisers and their stability properties

As mentioned in the introduction, the centraliser lattice of a t.d.l.c. group G consists of the local equivalence classes of subgroups of the form $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$, where U is a compact open subgroup of G and K a closed normal subgroup of U. The main goal of this section is to establish conditions ensuring that the equivalence class $[\mathrm{C}_U(K)]$ depends only on $[K]$, but neither on the choice of the open compact subgroup U nor on the locally normal representative K of $[K]$. This can be interpreted as a stability property of the centralisers. The key result in this direction is the following.

Proposition 3.1. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group. Assume that $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and that the only abelian locally normal subgroup of G is the identity subgroup. Then, for every locally normal subgroup K of G and all open compact subgroups $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{C}_U(K \cap U) = \mathrm{C}_U(K \cap V).$$

In particular $[\mathrm{C}_U(K \cap U)]$ depends only on $[K]$.

The proof of Proposition 3.1 requires a number of technical preparations and will only be given at the end of this chapter.

3.1 The quasi-centre

Let G be a locally compact group. The **quasi-centre** of G is defined as the following of all elements whose centraliser is open. This notion is due to Burger–Mozes [3]; its basic properties are described by the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be a locally compact group. Then:*

(i) $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$ *is a (not necessarily closed) characteristic subgroup of G.*

(ii) $\mathrm{QZ}(O) \leq \mathrm{QZ}(G)$ *for any open subgroup $O \leq G$.*

(iii) For any closed normal subgroup N of G, the image of $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$ under the projection to G/N is contained in $\mathrm{QZ}(G/N)$.

(iv) $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$ *contains every discrete subgroup of* G *whose normaliser in* G *is open. In particular, all discrete normal subgroups and all finite locally normal subgroups are contained in* $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$*.*

Proof. (i) For all $g, h \in G$, we have $\mathrm{C}_G(gh) \geq \mathrm{C}_G(g) \cap \mathrm{C}_G(h)$. This implies that $gh \in \mathrm{QZ}(G)$ as soon as $g, h \in \mathrm{QZ}(G)$. Part (i) follows.

(ii) Let $O \leq G$ be open. Since $\mathrm{C}_G(g) \geq \mathrm{C}_O(g)$ for any $g \in G$, so that $\mathrm{C}_G(g)$ is open as soon as $\mathrm{C}_O(g)$ is so. Part (ii) follows.

(iii) Clear since the projection $G \to G/N$ is an open map.

(iv) Let H be a discrete subgroup of G such that $\mathrm{N}_G(H)$ is open. Then $O = H\mathrm{N}_G(H)$ is open in G, and contains H as a discrete normal subgroup. Therefore, the O-conjugacy class of every element of H is discrete in O, which implies that the centraliser in O of every element of H is open. Thus we have $H \leq \mathrm{QZ}(O) \leq QZ(G)$ by (ii). $\square$

3.2 Quasi-centralisers

The first step towards Proposition 3.1 is to define a notion of centralisers of a subgroup that depends only on its local equivalence class.

Definition 3.3. Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let H and K be subgroups of G. The **quasi-centraliser** of K in H is given by

$$\mathrm{QC}_H(K) := \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{B}(G)} \mathrm{C}_H(K \cap U).$$

Clearly the quasi-centraliser $\mathrm{QC}_H(K)$ contains the centraliser $\mathrm{C}_H(K)$. Moreover, the quasi-centraliser is a subgroup of G, since $\mathrm{C}_H(K \cap U)\mathrm{C}_H(K \cap V) \subseteq \mathrm{C}_H(K \cap U \cap V)$. Similarly we have $\mathrm{QC}_H(K) = \mathrm{QC}_H(K \cap U)$ for any open subgroup U, so that $\mathrm{QC}_H(K)$ depends only on the local equivalence class $\alpha = [K]$ and we can write $\mathrm{QC}_H(\alpha)$ without ambiguity. We emphasize that the quasi-centraliser of a subgroup need not be closed, and some caution is required in saying that two subgroups 'quasi-commute', as the relation 'A is contained in the quasi-centraliser of B' is not symmetric in general. Notice that the quasi-centre $\mathrm{QZ}(H)$ of H is just $\mathrm{QC}_H(H)$.

The following observation is borrowed from [1, Prop. 2.6].

Lemma 3.4. *Let G be a group, let U and V be subgroups of G, and let $W \leq U \cap V$. Suppose $\theta : U \to V$ is an (abstract) isomorphism such that $\theta(x) = x$ for all $x \in W$, and suppose also that $\mathrm{C}_G(W \cap g^{-1}Wg) = 1$ for all $g \in U$. Then $U = V$ and $\theta = \mathrm{id}_U$.*

Proof. Let $g \in U$ and let $x \in W \cap g^{-1}Wg$. Then

$$gxg^{-1} = \theta(gxg^{-1}) = \theta(g)\theta(x)\theta(g^{-1}) = \theta(g)x\theta(g^{-1}),$$

so $g^{-1}\theta(g)$ centralises x. This shows that $g^{-1}\theta(g) \in \mathrm{C}_G(W \cap g^{-1}Wg) = 1$. Thus $g = \theta(g)$. $\square$

The following is elementary, and will be used frequently without comment.

Lemma 3.5. *Let G be a group and let H be a subgroup of G. Then*

$$\mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H)) \geq H \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))) = \mathrm{C}_G(H). \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.6. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and H be a subgroup of G.*

(i) If $\mathrm{QZ}(H) = 1$, then $\mathrm{QC}_G(H) \cap \mathrm{N}_G(H) = \mathrm{C}_G(H)$.

(ii) Suppose $\mathrm{N}_G(H)$ is open and $\mathrm{QZ}(H)$ is discrete and torsion-free. Then $H \cap \overline{\mathrm{QC}_G(H)}$ is discrete and torsion-free. In particular, $\mathrm{QC}_G(H)$ is not dense in G unless H is discrete and torsion-free.

(iii) If $\mathrm{N}_G(H)$ is open and $\mathrm{QZ}(H)$ is discrete and torsion-free, then $\mathrm{QC}_G(H)$ is locally equivalent to $\mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U)$ for any open subgroup U. In particular we have $\mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{QC}_G(H)) = \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U)) = \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_U(H \cap U))$.

Proof. (i) Let $x \in \mathrm{QC}_G(H) \cap \mathrm{N}_G(H)$. Then by conjugation x induces an automorphism of H that fixes $H \cap U$ pointwise for some open compact subgroup U of G; this automorphism is trivial by Lemma 3.4, so in fact $x \in \mathrm{C}_G(H)$. The reverse inclusion is clear.

(ii) Let U be any open compact subgroup of G. Then $\mathrm{N}_G(H \cap U)$ is open since it contains $\mathrm{N}_G(H) \cap U$. Moreover $\mathrm{QZ}(H \cap U) = 1$ since $\mathrm{QZ}(H)$ is discrete and torsion-free, and we have $\mathrm{QC}_G(H) = \mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U)$. Therefore, it follows from part (i) that $\mathrm{QC}_G(H) = \mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U)$ has empty intersection with the open subset $\mathrm{N}_G(H \cap U) \setminus \mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U)$ of G. This property is thus inherited by $\overline{\mathrm{QC}_G(H)}$. Hence $H \cap U \cap \overline{\mathrm{QC}_G(H)} \leq \mathrm{Z}(H \cap U) = 1$. Thus $H \cap \overline{\mathrm{QC}_G(H)}$ intersects trivially any open compact subgroup of G, and is thus a discrete and torsion-free subgroup, as claimed.

(iii) Let U be any open compact subgroup of G. Then $V = U \cap \mathrm{N}_G(H)$ is compact and open. We have $\mathrm{QC}_G(H) = \mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U)$. Since $H \cap U$ has trivial quasi-centre, part (i) implies that

$$\mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U) \cap V \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U) \cap \mathrm{N}_G(H \cap U) = \mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U).$$

Since $\mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U) \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U)$ by the definition of the quasi-centraliser, we infer that $\mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U) \cap V = \mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U) \cap V$. Thus $[\mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U)] = [\mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U)]$, as desired. ☐

Lemma 3.7. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let H and K be subgroups of G such that $\mathrm{QZ}(H) = 1$ and such that $|H \cap K|$, $|H : \mathrm{N}_H(K)|$ and $|K : \mathrm{N}_K(H)|$ are all finite. Then H centralises an open subgroup of K.*

Proof. Given an open compact subgroup U of G, the intersection $U \cap H \cap K$ is finite, $\mathrm{N}_{U \cap H}(K)$ has finite index in $U \cap H$, and $\mathrm{N}_{U \cap K}(H)$ has finite index in $U \cap K$. By replacing U with an open subgroup, we may ensure that $U \cap H \cap K = 1$, $U \cap H \leq \mathrm{N}_H(K)$ and $U \cap K \leq \mathrm{N}_K(H)$. We see that $U \cap H$ and $U \cap K$ normalise each other and have trivial intersection, so $[U \cap H, U \cap K] = 1$; in particular $U \cap K \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(H)$. Moreover, $U \cap K$ normalises H, so in fact $U \cap K \leq \mathrm{C}_G(H)$ by Lemma 3.6(i). ☐

3.3 C-stability

Definition 3.8. Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let H be a closed subgroup of G. Say H is **C-stable** in G if $\mathrm{QC}_G(H) \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$ is discrete and torsion-free.

We shall mostly be interested in the case that H is compact. The following shows that, in that case, C-stability could have equivalently been defined to mean that $\mathrm{QC}_G(H\mathrm{C}_G(H))$ is discrete and torsion-free.

Lemma 3.9. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let H be a compact subgroup of G. Then*

$$\mathrm{QC}_G(H) \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H)) = \mathrm{QC}_G(H\mathrm{C}_G(H)).$$

Proof. Notice first that $H\mathrm{C}_G(H)$ is a closed subgroup of G since H is compact. Let $x \in \mathrm{QC}_G(H\mathrm{C}_G(H))$, so x centralises an open subgroup of $H\mathrm{C}_G(H)$. Then clearly x centralises an open subgroup of every subgroup of $H\mathrm{C}_G(H)$, so in particular $x \in \mathrm{QC}_G(H)$ and $x \in \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$.

Conversely, let $x \in \mathrm{QC}_G(H) \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$. Let U be an open compact subgroup of G that contains H. Then there is an open subgroup K of H such that $x \in \mathrm{C}_G(K)$, and also an open subgroup V of U such that $x \in \mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_V(H))$. So x centralises the compact group $K\mathrm{C}_V(H)$. Now $K\mathrm{C}_V(H)$ is open in $H\mathrm{C}_U(H)$, since it is closed and the index $|H\mathrm{C}_U(H) : K\mathrm{C}_V(H)|$ is finite, and in turn $H\mathrm{C}_U(H)$ is open in $H\mathrm{C}_G(H)$ since $H\mathrm{C}_U(H) = (H\mathrm{C}_G(H)) \cap U$. Hence x centralises an open subgroup of $H\mathrm{C}_G(H)$ as required. ☐

The next lemma records the most basic properties of C-stable subgroups.

Lemma 3.10. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and H be a C-stable subgroup.*

(i) $H \cap U$ is C-stable for any open subgroup U of G.

(ii) $\mathrm{QZ}(H)$ is discrete and torsion-free.

(iii) If H is discrete, then it is torsion-free.

Proof. (i) Any open subgroup U of G is closed, so that $H \cap U$ is closed. Morever we have $\mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U) = \mathrm{QC}_G(H)$ and $\mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U) \geq \mathrm{C}_G(H)$, so that $\mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U)) \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U) \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U)) \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(H) \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$$

and so $\mathrm{QC}_G(H \cap U) \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H \cap U))$ is indeed discrete and torsion-free.

(ii) We have $\mathrm{QZ}(H) = \mathrm{QC}_H(H) \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(H)$. Moreover, any $g \in \mathrm{QZ}(H) \leq H$ commutes with $\mathrm{C}_G(H)$, so that $\mathrm{QZ}(H) \leq \mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H)) \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$. Therefore $\mathrm{QZ}(H) \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(G) \cap QC_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$, and part (ii) follows.

(iii) If H is discrete, then $\mathrm{QZ}(H) = H$, so (iii) follows from (ii). ☐

For each integer $n > 0$, we define inductively

$$\mathrm{C}_H^{n+1}(K) = \mathrm{C}_H(\mathrm{C}_H^n(K)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{QC}_H^{n+1}(\alpha) = \mathrm{QC}_H(\mathrm{QC}_H^n(\alpha)),$$

where H and K are subgroups of G and α is either a subgroup, or a local equivalence class of subgroups. For convenience we also adopt the convention $\mathrm{C}_H^0(K) = K = \mathrm{QC}_H^0(K)$.

Lemma 3.11. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let H be a C-stable subgroup of G such that $\mathrm{N}_G(H)$ is open. Let $n \geq 0$.*

(i) For all open subgroups L of G, then $\mathrm{C}_L^n(H)$ is C-stable in G and $\mathrm{QZ}(\mathrm{C}_L^n(H))$ is discrete and torsion-free.

(ii) We have $\mathrm{QC}_U(\mathrm{QC}_G^n(H)) = \mathrm{C}_U^{n+1}(H \cap U)$ for all open compact subgroups U of G. In particular $\mathrm{QC}_U(H) = \mathrm{C}_U(H \cap U)$.

Proof. (i) We proceed by induction on n. For $n = 0$, the fact that $\mathrm{QZ}(H)$ is discrete and torsion-free follows from Lemma 3.10(ii).

We now let $n > 0$ and assume that $H' = \mathrm{C}_L^{n-1}(H)$ is C-stable, that its quasi-centre is discrete and torsion-free, and that its normaliser is open. Let $K = \mathrm{C}_L^n(H) = \mathrm{C}_L(H')$ and note that it is a closed subgroup of G. On the one hand $H' \cap L$ is locally equivalent to H' and contained in $\mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_L(H'))$, so $\mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(K)) \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(H')$; on the other hand we also have $\mathrm{QC}_G(K) = \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H'))$. Hence

$$\mathrm{QC}_G(K) \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(K)) \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(H') \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H')),$$

so $K = \mathrm{C}_L(H')$ is C-stable in G. In particular $\mathrm{QZ}(\mathrm{C}_L(H'))$ is discrete and torsion-free by Lemma 3.10(ii). Since L and $\mathrm{N}_G(H')$ are both open, so is $\mathrm{N}_L(H')$. The latter normalises $\mathrm{C}_L(H')$, which shows that $\mathrm{N}_G(\mathrm{C}_L(H'))$ is open. This completes the proof of the induction step.

(ii) Let U be an open compact subgroup of G. Without loss of generality $H \leq U$, since neither side of the desired equation is affected by replacing H with $H \cap U$, which is itself C-stable by Lemma 3.10(i). Thus H is compact, and $\mathrm{QZ}(H) = 1$ by Lemma 3.10(ii).

Let us deal first with the case $n = 0$: we must show that $\mathrm{QC}_U(H)$ commutes with H. To this end, consider $x \in \mathrm{QC}_U(H)$, so $x \in \mathrm{C}_U(K)$ for $K = H \cap V$, where V is an open compact subgroup of G. Since K is an open subgroup of the compact group H, it has finitely many H-conjugates. Therefore, by replacing K with its core in H, we may assume K is normal in H. Notice moreover that K is locally equivalent to H, ensuring that K is C-stable by Lemma 3.10(i).

Now $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$ centralises an open subgroup of H so that $\mathrm{C}_U(K) \cap H = 1$ since $\mathrm{QZ}(H) = 1$. Also, H normalises $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$ since $H \leq U$ and since H normalises K. Furthermore H is locally normal, so that $\mathrm{N}_U(H)$ has finite index in U and hence $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{C}_U(K)}(H)$ has finite index in $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$. Therefore we may invoke Lemma 3.7, which ensures that H centralises an open subgroup of $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$.

Since K is an open subgroup H, it follows that K and $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$ are both locally normal by Lemma 2.1. Now part (i) implies that $\mathrm{QZ}(\mathrm{C}_U(K)) = 1$. Moreover H normalises $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$ since H is contained in U and K is normal in H. Hence

H centralises $\mathrm{C}_U(K)$ by Lemma 3.6(i), and in particular H centralises x. This concludes the proof for $n = 0$.

For the general case, note first that $\mathrm{C}^n_U(H)$ is locally normal and C-stable by part (i). Therefore, by repeated application of Lemma 3.6(iii) we have the equation

$$\mathrm{QC}^{n+1}_U(H) = \mathrm{QC}_U(\mathrm{QC}^n_U(H)) = \mathrm{QC}_U(\mathrm{C}^n_U(H)).$$

The desired conclusion follows, since by the base case $n = 0$, we have

$$\mathrm{QC}_U(\mathrm{C}^n_U(H)) = \mathrm{C}_U(\mathrm{C}^n_U(H)).$$

□

We are now able to define a partial map $[\alpha] \mapsto [\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha)]$ on the structure lattice.

Corollary 3.12. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and K be a locally normal C-stable subgroup. Then, for all open compact subgroups $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, we have*

$$\mathrm{C}_U(K \cap U) = \mathrm{C}_U(K \cap V).$$

In particular we have $[\mathrm{C}_U(K \cap U)] = [\mathrm{QC}_G(K)]$, so that the local equivalence class $[\mathrm{C}_U(K \cap U)]$ depends only on $[K]$.

Proof. Follows from part (ii) of Lemma 3.11. □

3.4 Local C-stability

Corollary 3.12 motivates the following.

Definition 3.13. A t.d.l.c. group G is called **locally C-stable** if $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and all locally normal subgroups of G are C-stable in G.

Our next goal is to establish the following characterisation of locally C-stable groups.

Proposition 3.14. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group. Then G is locally C-stable if and only if $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and the only abelian locally normal subgroup of G is the identity subgroup.*

Moreover, if those equivalent conditions are satisfied, then every locally normal subgroup of G has trivial quasi-centre.

The proof requires the following variation on Lemma 3.4, giving a condition under which a locally normal subgroup has trivial centraliser in G.

Lemma 3.15. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group such that $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and let L be a locally normal subgroup of G such that $\mathrm{C}_U(L) = 1$ for some open subgroup U of G. Then:*

(i) $\mathrm{C}_G(L) = 1$.

(ii) Let H and K be open subgroups of G containing L. Suppose $\theta : H \to K$ is an isomorphism of topological groups such that $\theta(x) = x$ for all $x \in L$. Then $H = K$ and $\theta = \mathrm{id}_H$.

Proof. We start with (ii). We may assume $U \leq \mathrm{N}_G(L)$, and choose an open compact subgroup W contained in H such that $W\theta(W)$ is contained in U. Let $g \in W$ and let $x \in L$. Then

$$gxg^{-1} = \theta(gxg^{-1}) = \theta(g)\theta(x)\theta(g^{-1}) = \theta(g)x\theta(g^{-1}),$$

so $g^{-1}\theta(g)$ centralises x. This shows that $g^{-1}\theta(g) \in \mathrm{C}_U(L) = 1$. Thus $g = \theta(g)$, that is, θ fixes W pointwise.

We may now apply Lemma 3.4, since $\mathrm{C}_G(W \cap g^{-1}Wg) \leq \mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ for all $g \in G$. Thus $H = K$ and $\theta = \mathrm{id}_H$. Part (ii) follows.

By applying (ii) to the automorphisms of G induced by conjugation by elements of $\mathrm{C}_G(L)$, we infer that $\mathrm{C}_G(L) \leq \mathrm{Z}(G) = 1$, thereby confirming (i). ☐

Proof of Proposition 3.14. Suppose that $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and that G has no non-trivial abelian locally normal subgroup.

We first claim that every locally normal subgroup has trivial quasi-centre. Indeed, let L be a locally normal subgroup and U be an open compact subgroup of G containing L as a normal subgroup (see Lemma 2.1(iv)). Let $g \in \mathrm{QZ}(L)$. Then we have $g \in L \cap \mathrm{C}_U(M)$ for some open subgroup M of L. By Lemma 2.1 the group $L \cap \mathrm{C}_U(M)$ is locally normal in G. Since $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$, it follows that $L \cap \mathrm{C}_U(M)$ is either trivial or infinite. In the latter case, it must intersect M non-trivially since M is of finite index in L. This would imply that $M \cap \mathrm{C}_U(M)$ is non-trivial. This contradicts the hypothesis since $M \cap \mathrm{C}_U(M) = \mathrm{Z}(M)$ is an abelian locally normal subgroup of G. Therefore we deduce that $L \cap \mathrm{C}_U(M)$ is trivial, which implies that g is trivial. Hence $\mathrm{QZ}(L) = 1$ as claimed.

We next claim that for any locally normal subgroup L, we have $\mathrm{QC}_G(L\mathrm{C}_G(L)) = 1$. This implies that L is C-stable in view of Lemma 3.9.

Let U be a compact open subgroup of G containing L as a normal subgroup (see Lemma 2.1(iv)). We have $\mathrm{QC}_G(L\mathrm{C}_G(L)) = \mathrm{QC}_G(L\mathrm{C}_G(L) \cap U) = \mathrm{QC}_G(L\mathrm{C}_U(L))$ since $L \leq U$. Thus it suffices to show that $\mathrm{QC}_G(K) = 1$, where $K = L\mathrm{C}_U(L)$.

Notice that K is normalised by U, so that K is locally normal. Given any $V \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ contained in U, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{C}_V(K) & \leq & \mathrm{C}_V(L) \cap \mathrm{C}_V(\mathrm{C}_U(L)) \\ & = & \mathrm{C}_U(L) \cap V \cap \mathrm{C}_V(\mathrm{C}_U(L)) \\ & = & \mathrm{C}_U(L) \cap \mathrm{C}_V(\mathrm{C}_U(L)). \end{array}$$

The latter is clearly abelian, and it is a locally normal subgroup by Lemma 2.1. It must thus be trivial by hypothesis. Hence $\mathrm{C}_V(K) = 1$, and therefore $\mathrm{C}_G(K) = 1$ by Lemma 3.15. On the other hand $\mathrm{QZ}(K) = 1$ by the first part of the proof above. Therefore, by Lemma 3.6(i) we have $\mathrm{QC}_G(K) \cap \mathrm{N}_G(K) = \mathrm{C}_G(K) = 1$. Since $\mathrm{N}_G(K)$ is open, it follows that $\mathrm{QC}_G(K)$ is discrete. Since moreover $\mathrm{N}_G(K)$ normalises $\mathrm{QC}_G(K)$, we infer that $\mathrm{QC}_G(K)$ is a discrete subgroup whose normaliser is open. Lemma 3.2(iv) therefore yields $\mathrm{QC}_G(K) \leq \mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$, as desired.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and that G has a non-trivial abelian locally normal subgroup L. Then L is infinite, in particular non-discrete, and moreover $L \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(L) \cap \mathrm{QC}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(L))$, so L is not C-stable. ☐

Finally, we can now complete the proof of the criterion announced at the beginning of the chapter.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. In view of Proposition 3.14, the hypotheses imply that G is locally C-stable. Therefore, the desired conclusions follow from Corollary 3.12. ☐

4 Direct decomposition of locally normal subgroups

4.1 Local decomposition lattices

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let H be a C-stable locally normal subgroup of G. Let K be an abstract direct factor of H. Then K is C-stable in G. Moreover $\mathrm{C}_H(K)$ is the unique direct complement of K in H and $K = \mathrm{C}^2_H(K)$, so in particular K is a compact subgroup of G.*

Proof. Let $H = K \times L$. Then $\mathrm{Z}(K) \leq \mathrm{QZ}(H) = 1$, so $\mathrm{C}_H(K) = L$ and similarly $\mathrm{C}_H(L) = K$. In particular, K is closed and hence compact. In addition $K\mathrm{C}_U(K)$

contains H and also contains $\mathrm{C}_U(H)$, so $\mathrm{QC}_G(K\mathrm{C}_G(K))$ is discrete and torsion-free. Hence K is C-stable in G by Lemma 3.9. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Let G be a group such that $\mathrm{Z}(G) = 1$, let K be a direct factor of G, and let H be a subgroup of G such that $H = \mathrm{C}^2_G(H)$. Then $H = (H \cap K) \times \mathrm{C}_H(K)$.*

Proof. We have $G = K \times \mathrm{C}_G(K)$; let π_1 and π_2 be the projections onto K and $\mathrm{C}_G(K)$ respectively associated with this decomposition. Then $H \leq \pi_1(H) \times \pi_2(H)$. Moreover $\pi_1(H)$ and $\pi_2(H)$ are centralised by $\mathrm{C}_G(H)$, so contained in H. Thus $H = \pi_1(H) \times \pi_2(H)$, which implies $\pi_1(H) = H \cap K$ and $\pi_2(H) = \mathrm{C}_H(K)$. $\square$

Definition 4.3. Given a topological group H and subgroup K, say K is an **almost direct factor** of H if there is a closed subgroup L of H of finite index such that K is a direct factor of L. Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let H be a C-stable locally normal subgroup of G. Define the **local decomposition lattice** $\mathcal{LD}(G; H)$ of G at H to be the subset of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ consisting of elements $[K]$ where K is locally normal in G and K is an almost direct factor of H.

Lemma 4.4. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group, let H be a C-stable locally normal subgroup of G, and let K be an open subgroup of H. Then $\mathcal{LD}(G; H) = \mathcal{LD}(G; K)$ as subsets of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$.*

Proof. It is clear from the definition that $\mathcal{LD}(G; K) \subseteq \mathcal{LD}(G; H)$. Conversely, suppose an open subgroup of H decomposes as $L_1 \times L_2$ with L_1 and L_2 locally normal. Then $(L_1 \cap K) \times (L_2 \cap K)$ is open in K with an equivalent decomposition and $L_1 \cap K$ and $L_2 \cap K$ remain locally normal, so $[L_1]$ and $[L_2]$ are contained in $\mathcal{LD}(G; K)$. $\square$

Consequently, it makes sense to write $\mathcal{LD}(G; \alpha)$ where α is any element of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ that has a C-stable representative, and this lattice admits an action of G_α by conjugation. The case $\alpha = [G]$ is of particular interest, and we will define $\mathcal{LD}(G) := \mathcal{LD}(G; [G])$.

As the name suggests, the local decomposition lattice is a sublattice of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$, but more is true:

Theorem 4.5. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let $\alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$ have a C-stable representative. Then $\mathcal{LD}(G; \alpha)$ is a sublattice of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$, and internally it is a Boolean algebra (relative to the maximum α), with complementation map $\perp_\alpha : \beta \mapsto [\mathrm{QC}_G(\beta)] \wedge \alpha$.*

We will prove the following separately, as it will be reused later.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a meet-semilattice with a least element 0. Suppose $\perp\colon \mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathcal{M}$ is an order-reversing involution such that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\alpha \wedge \beta = 0$ if and only if $\beta \leq \alpha^\perp$. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is a Boolean algebra, with minimum 0 and maximum $0^\perp$, complementation given by $\perp$ and join operation given by $\alpha \vee \beta = (\alpha^\perp \wedge \beta^\perp)^\perp$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$. The existence of an order-reversing bijection ensures that $\mathcal{M}$ is a lattice, with maximum and join as given. For all $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ we have $\alpha \vee \alpha^\perp = (\alpha^\perp \wedge \alpha)^\perp = 0^\perp$ and clearly $\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp = 0$, so $\alpha^\perp$ is a complement of α relative to the maximum element $0^\perp$.

It remains to show that $\mathcal{M}$ is distributive. We first show

$$\alpha \wedge \beta \leq \gamma \Leftrightarrow \alpha \leq \beta^\perp \vee \gamma, \tag{1}$$

for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{M}$. Using the properties of $\perp$ in the hypothesis, we have $\alpha \wedge \beta \leq \gamma$ if and only if $\alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma^\perp = 0$, while $\alpha \leq \beta^\perp \vee \gamma$ if and only if $\delta = 0$ where $\delta = \alpha \wedge (\beta^\perp \vee \gamma)^\perp$. Now $\delta = \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma^\perp$, so (1) is proved.

Now let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathcal{M}$. By (1) we have

$$(\alpha \vee \delta) \wedge \beta \leq \gamma \Leftrightarrow \alpha \vee \delta \leq \beta^\perp \vee \gamma \Leftrightarrow (\alpha \leq \beta^\perp \vee \gamma \text{ and } \delta \leq \beta^\perp \vee \gamma).$$

Using (1) again we have $\alpha \leq \beta^\perp \vee \gamma \Leftrightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta \leq \gamma$ and $\delta \leq \beta^\perp \vee \gamma \Leftrightarrow \delta \wedge \beta \leq \gamma$. Finally, the conjunction of the inequalities $\alpha \wedge \beta \leq \gamma$ and $\delta \wedge \beta \leq \gamma$ is given by the inequality $(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vee (\delta \wedge \beta) \leq \gamma$, proving the distributive law. ☐

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Fix a locally normal, C-stable representative H of α; in particular, $\mathrm{QZ}(H) = 1$.

Let K and L be almost direct factors of H such that K and L are locally normal in G. Then $K\mathrm{C}_H(K)$ and $L\mathrm{C}_H(L)$ are both open in H, and $K \cap \mathrm{C}_H(K) = L \cap \mathrm{C}_H(L) = 1$. Without changing the commensurability class of K or its status as an almost direct factor of H, we may replace K with $\mathrm{C}^2_H(K)$ and so assume $K = \mathrm{C}^2_H(K)$. Let $M = L\mathrm{C}_H(L)$ and let $K_2 = K \cap M$. Then $K_2 = \mathrm{C}_M(\mathrm{C}_H(K))$. Since K is C-stable in H, in fact $\mathrm{C}_H(K) = \mathrm{C}_H(K_2)$ by Lemma 3.11; in turn, $\mathrm{C}_H(K)$ has the same centraliser in H as $\mathrm{C}_M(K)$ for the same reason. So in fact $K_2 = \mathrm{C}^2_M(K_2)$. It follows by Lemma 4.2 that $K_2 \cap L$ is a direct factor of K_2. In turn, K_2 is a direct factor of $K_2\mathrm{C}_H(K)$, which is open in H. Thus $K_2 \cap L$ is an almost direct factor of H.

By a similar argument, there is an open subgroup R of $\mathrm{C}_H(K)$ that factorises as $(R \cap L) \times \mathrm{C}_R(L)$, so there is an open subgroup of H that factorises as

$$K_2 \times (R \cap L) \times \mathrm{C}_R(L).$$

The first two factors are contained in K_2L, while the last factor centralises K_2L; additionally $K_2L \cap \mathrm{C}_R(L) \leq \mathrm{QZ}(H) = 1$. It follows that K_2L is an almost direct factor of H. Finally, note that K_2 and L are both locally normal, and this property is inherited by both their intersection and the closure of their product. We conclude that $[K_2 \cap L], [K_2L] \in \mathcal{LD}(G;\alpha)$, so $\mathcal{LD}(G;\alpha)$ is a sublattice of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$.

By Lemma 3.6, $[\mathrm{QC}_G(K)] \wedge \alpha$ has a representative $\mathrm{C}_H(K)$; this also represents an element of $\mathcal{LD}(G;\alpha)$, so $\perp_\alpha$ preserves $\mathcal{LD}(G;\alpha)$. One has $[K] \wedge \beta = 0$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{LD}(G;\alpha)$ whenever $\beta \leq [K]^\perp$, since $\mathrm{QZ}(K) = 1$, and conversely $[K] \wedge \beta = 0$ implies by Lemma 3.7 that some representative of β centralises a representative of $[K]$, so in this case $\beta \leq [K]^\perp$. It is also clear that $\perp_\alpha$ is an order-reversing involution on $\mathcal{LD}(G;\alpha)$. Thus $\mathcal{LD}(G;\alpha)$ is a Boolean algebra by Lemma 4.6. ☐

Proof of Theorem I (i). Since G has trivial quasi-centre, it follows that the quasi-centraliser $\mathrm{QC}_G(U)$ of any open compact subgroup of G is trivial. In particular, U is C-stable in G, so by Theorem 4.5, $\mathcal{LD}(G;[U]) = \mathcal{LD}(G)$ is a Boolean algebra. ☐

It is clear that the relation "A is a direct factor of B" is transitive. A similar transitivity applies to local decomposition lattices:

Lemma 4.7. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$ have C-stable representatives. Then $\mathcal{LD}(G;\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{LD}(G;\beta)$ if and only if $\alpha \in \mathcal{LD}(G;\beta)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\alpha \in \mathcal{LD}(G;\beta)$. Then there is a representative H of α and a representative K of β such that H is a direct factor of K. It follows that all almost direct factors of H are also almost direct factors of K. ☐

4.2 Locally finitely decomposable t.d.l.c. groups

The following are natural properties to consider in the context of local decomposition lattices:

Definition 4.8. Let H be a group. Say H is **finitely decomposable** if $H = H_1 \times \cdots \times H_n$ for some $n \geq 1$, such that each H_i is indecomposable. Given a t.d.l.c. group G, say G is **locally finitely decomposable** if every open compact subgroup of G is finitely decomposable.

Proposition 4.9. *Let G be a compact group such that $\mathrm{Z}(G) = 1$. Then exactly one of the following holds:*

(i) *$G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$ for some $n \geq 1$, such that each G_i is indecomposable. Moreover, $\{G_1, \dots, G_n\}$ is precisely the set of indecomposable direct factors of G; in particular,* $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ *acts on $\{G_1, \dots, G_n\}$ and there are exactly 2^n direct factors of G.*

(ii) *G is topologically isomorphic to an infinite Cartesian product of closed subgroups. In particular, G has uncountably many closed direct factors up to commensurability.*

Proof. For any direct factor H of G, then $\mathrm{C}_G(H)$ is the complement of H and thus also a direct factor, so $H = \mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$. Suppose $G = G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$ for some $n \geq 1$, such that each G_i is indecomposable. Let K be an indecomposable direct factor of G. Then $G = K\mathrm{C}_G(K)$, and $K \cap \mathrm{C}_G(K) \leq \mathrm{Z}(G) = 1$. Since G does not centralise K, there is some i such that G_i does not centralise K. This implies $K \cap G_i > 1$. Moreover, $K \cap G_i$ is a direct factor of both K and G_i, by Lemma 4.2. Hence $K = G_i$ by the fact that K and G_i are indecomposable.

Suppose G is not finitely decomposable. We define a family $\{G_{i,j}\}_{1 \leq j \leq i}$ of non-trivial subgroups as follows, so that for all n, $G = G_{n,1} \times \cdots \times G_{n,n}$ and $G_{n,n}$ is not finitely decomposable.

Set $G_{1,1} = G$. Suppose we have $G = G_{n,1} \times \cdots \times G_{n,n}$ for some n. Choose some non-trivial direct decomposition $G_{n,n} = H_n \times K_n$, ensuring that K_n is not finitely decomposable (this is always possible, as by induction $G_{n,n}$ is not finitely decomposable). Now set $G_{n+1,n} = H_n$, $G_{n+1,n+1} = K_n$ and $G_{n+1,j} = G_{n,j}$ for $1 \leq j < n$.

Let $K = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{j,j}$. We claim now that

$$G \cong K \times \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{j+1,j}.$$

The decomposition $G = G_{n,1} \times \cdots \times G_{n+1,n+1}$ gives a continuous epimorphism $G \to \prod_{j=1}^{n} G_{n+1,j}$ with kernel $G_{n+1,n+1}$, and we note from the construction that $\prod_{j=1}^{n} G_{n+1,j} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} G_{j+1,j}$. These epimorphisms are compatible with each other as n varies so that they generate an inverse system, with a limit homomorphism $\phi : G \to \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{j+1,j}$. We see that $\ker \phi$ is precisely K. In addition $\phi(\mathrm{C}_G(K))$ contains $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{j+1,j}$, since $G_{j+1,j}$ centralises $G_{n+1,n+1}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, so $\phi(\mathrm{C}_G(K)) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} G_{j+1,j}$. In particular $G = K\mathrm{C}_G(K)$: this implies $K \cap \mathrm{C}_G(K) \leq \mathrm{Z}(G) = 1$, so in fact $G = K \times \mathrm{C}_G(K)$. The restriction of ϕ to $\mathrm{C}_G(K)$ is consequently bijective, giving the desired isomorphism. We now obtain uncountably many direct factors $G_J = \prod_{j \in J} G_{j+1,j}$ by letting J range over all subsets of $\mathbf{N}$. For two such direct factors $\prod_{j\in J_1} G_{j+1,j}$ and $\prod_{j\in J_2} G_{j+1,j}$ to be commensurate, the symmetric difference of the sets J_1 and J_2 must be finite. This defines an equivalence relation on the power set of $\mathbf{N}$ whose equivalence classes are countable, so there must be uncountably many equivalence classes. ☐

Corollary 4.10. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group with $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$.*

(i) G is locally finitely decomposable if and only if G has a basis of identity neighbourhoods consisting of open compact subgroups that are finitely decomposable.

(ii) Suppose G is first-countable. Then G is locally finitely decomposable if and only if $\mathcal{LD}(G)$ is countable.

Proof. (i) The necessity of the condition is obvious. Conversely, if G is not locally finitely decomposable, then G has some open compact subgroup V which is not finitely decomposable. Since G has trivial quasi-centre, the group V must be center-free, and is thus an infinite Cartesian product of closed subgroups by Proposition 4.9. Now, any open subgroup W of V contains infinitely many direct factors of V; those factors are then also direct factors of W, and hence W cannot be finitely decomposable.

(ii) Suppose that G is locally finitely decomposable. Since $\mathcal{LD}(G) = \mathcal{LD}(U)$ for any open compact subgroup U, we may assume that G is compact. In this case G has only countably many open subgroups, each with only finitely many direct factors, and thus $\mathcal{LD}(G)$ is countable.

Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{LD}(G)$ is countable. Then given an open compact subgroup U of G, the direct factors of U fall into countably many commensurability classes. Thus U is finitely decomposable by Proposition 4.9. ☐

Proposition 4.11. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let H be a C-stable locally normal subgroup that is locally finitely decomposable. Then $\mathcal{LD}(G;H) = \mathcal{LD}(H)$; indeed $\mathcal{LD}(G;H)$ contains $\mathcal{LD}(K)$ for every almost direct factor K of H.*

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{LD}(G;H) \subseteq \mathcal{LD}(H)$. Let L be an open compact subgroup of H, and let K be a direct factor of L. Then $\mathrm{N}_G(L)$ is open in G by Lemma 2.1 (ii), and it preserves the set X of indecomposable direct factors of L; since X is finite, there is an open subgroup R of $\mathrm{N}_G(L)$ that normalises every indecomposable direct factor of L. In turn K is a product of indecomposable direct factors of L, so it is normalised by R. Hence K is locally normal, so represents an element of $\mathcal{LD}(G;H)$. Hence $\mathcal{LD}(G;H) = \mathcal{LD}(H)$, and $\mathcal{LD}(H)$ contains $\mathcal{LD}(H;K)$ by

Lemma 4.7. In turn, K is locally finitely decomposable, because given an open subgroup M of K, the direct factors of M are also direct factors of $M\mathrm{C}_H(K)$, which is an open subgroup of H. Hence $\mathcal{LD}(H;K) = \mathcal{LD}(K)$. ☐

5 The centraliser lattice and weakly branch actions

5.1 The centraliser lattice

It would be useful to combine all the local decomposition lattices of G (which are not necessarily individually preserved by the action of G) into a single Boolean algebra admitting a G-action. There are two difficulties here: one is that C-stability may not be well-behaved under intersections, and the other is that we need a unified notion of complementation. To avoid the first difficulty and overcome the second, we restrict our attention to locally C-stable groups in the sense of §3.4. Recall from Proposition 3.14 that these are precisely the t.d.l.c. groups with trivial quasi-centre and no non-trivial abelian locally normal subgroups. The resulting lattice will not be a sublattice of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ in general (because the join operation is different), but it arises from the structure lattice in a natural way.

Definition 5.1. Let G be a locally C-stable t.d.l.c. group. Define the map

$$\perp\colon \mathcal{LN}(G) \to \mathcal{LN}(G) : \alpha \mapsto [\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha)].$$

This is well-defined by Corollary 3.12. The **centraliser lattice** $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ is defined to be the set $\{\alpha^\perp \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)\}$ together with the map $\perp$ restricted to $\mathcal{LC}(G)$, the partial order inherited from $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ and the binary operations $\wedge_c$ and $\vee_c$ given by:

$$\alpha \wedge_c \beta = \alpha \wedge \beta$$
$$\alpha \vee_c \beta = (\alpha^\perp \wedge \beta^\perp)^\perp.$$

In general we will write $\vee$ instead of $\vee_c$ in contexts where it is clear that we are working inside the centraliser lattice.

Theorem 5.2. *Let G be a locally C-stable t.d.l.c. group.*

(i) The poset $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ is a Boolean algebra and $\perp^2 : \mathcal{LN}(G) \to \mathcal{LC}(G)$ is a surjective lattice homomorphism.

(ii) Fix $\alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$ and let θ be the map on $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ given by $\beta \mapsto \beta^{\perp^2} \wedge \alpha$. Then θ is an idempotent order-preserving map, and $\theta(\mathcal{LN}(G)) = \theta(\mathcal{LC}(G)) \supseteq \mathcal{LD}(G; \alpha)$. Moreover, $\theta^{-1}(\mathcal{LD}(G; \alpha)) \cap \mathcal{LC}(G)$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{LC}(G)$.

We need the following basic group theoretic facts.

Lemma 5.3. *Let G be a group such that every normal subgroup has trivial centre, in other words that G has no non-trivial abelian normal subgroups. Then the following equations are satisfied for any normal subgroups A and B of G.*

(i) $\mathrm{C}^2_G(A \cap B) = \mathrm{C}^2_G(A) \cap \mathrm{C}^2_G(B)$;

(ii) $\mathrm{C}_A(B) = \mathrm{C}_A(A \cap B)$;

(iii) $\mathrm{C}_A(\mathrm{C}_G(B)) = \mathrm{C}_A(\mathrm{C}_A(B))$.

Proof. (i) Let $K = \mathrm{C}^2_G(A)$ and let $L = \mathrm{C}^2_G(B)$. It is clear that

$$\mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(A \cap B)) \leq \mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{C}_G(A)\mathrm{C}_G(B)) = K \cap L,$$

so it suffices to show that $K \cap L$ centralises $\mathrm{C}_G(A \cap B)$. For this it is enough to show that $M = \mathrm{C}_G(A \cap B) \cap K \cap L = 1$, since all subgroups under consideration are normal. We see that $M \cap A \cap B \leq \mathrm{Z}(A \cap B) = 1$, so $M \cap A$ centralises B, in other words $M \cap A \leq \mathrm{C}_G(B)$. Then $M \cap A$ is centralised by L, so $M \cap A$ is central in M, so $M \cap A = 1$, and hence $M \leq \mathrm{C}_G(A)$. Since K centralises $\mathrm{C}_G(A)$ and contains M, we see that M is central in $\mathrm{C}_G(A)$ and hence trivial, as required.

(ii) Notice that $\mathrm{C}_A(A \cap B)$ is normal in G and has trivial intersection with $A \cap B$ (since $\mathrm{Z}(A \cap B) = 1$). Therefore $[\mathrm{C}_A(A \cap B), B] \subset \mathrm{C}_A(A \cap B) \cap B = 1$, whence $\mathrm{C}_A(A \cap B) \leq \mathrm{C}_A(B)$. The reverse inclusion is clear.

(iii) This a special case of (ii), using the normal subgroups A and $\mathrm{C}_G(B)$ instead of A and B. ☐

Proof of Theorem 5.2. (i) Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$, let A be a representative of α, and let U be an open compact subgroup of G such that $A \trianglelefteq U$. By Lemma 3.11, $\mathrm{C}^n_U(A)$ is then a representative of $\alpha^{\perp^n}$. We deduce $\alpha^{\perp^2} \geq \alpha$ and $\alpha^{\perp^3} = \alpha^{\perp}$ from Lemma 3.5. In particular, $\perp$ acts as an involution on $\mathcal{LC}(G)$, so $\perp^2(\mathcal{LN}(G)) = \mathcal{LC}(G)$. It is clear that $\perp$ is order-reversing (so $\perp^2$ is order-preserving). Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$ and choose representatives A and B of α, β respectively that are normal in the open compact subgroup V. Then we have $\mathrm{C}_V(AB) = \mathrm{C}_V(A) \cap \mathrm{C}_V(B)$, so that

$$(\alpha \vee \beta)^{\perp} = \alpha^{\perp} \wedge \beta^{\perp}. \tag{2}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ is a meet-sublattice of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$. Since the only abelian normal subgroup of V is the trivial one, it also follows from Lemma 5.3 (i) that $\perp^2$ is compatible with the meet operation.

By Lemma 3.7, $\alpha \wedge \beta = 0$ if and only if B centralises an open subgroup of A, which amounts to saying that $\beta \leq \alpha^\perp$. Hence $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ as defined is a Boolean algebra by Lemma 4.6.

We see that $\perp^2$ is compatible with the join operations in passing from $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ to $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ as follows, using (2):

$$\alpha^{\perp^2} \vee_c \beta^{\perp^2} = (\alpha^{\perp^3} \wedge \beta^{\perp^3})^\perp = (\alpha^\perp \wedge \beta^\perp)^\perp = (\alpha \vee \beta)^{\perp^2}.$$

Hence $\perp^2$ is a lattice homomorphism.

(ii) It is clear that $\theta(\mathcal{LN}(G)) = \theta(\mathcal{LC}(G))$, since $\perp^2$ is a projection of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ to $\mathcal{LC}(G)$. It is also clear that θ is order-preserving. Given $\beta \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$ we have

$$\theta^2(\beta) = (\beta^{\perp^2} \wedge \alpha)^{\perp^2} \wedge \alpha = \beta^{\perp^4} \wedge \alpha^{\perp^2} \wedge \alpha = \beta^{\perp^2} \wedge \alpha,$$

so $\theta^2 = \theta$.

We know that $\perp^2$ is the identity on $\mathcal{LC}(G)$, so the restriction of θ to $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ is given by $\beta \mapsto \beta \wedge \alpha$. Let A be a representative of α and let K be a direct factor of A. Choose $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ such that both A and K are normal in U. Then $K = \mathrm{C}^2_A(K)$, so $K = \mathrm{C}_A(\mathrm{C}_U(K))$ by Lemma 5.3 (iii). In other words, $[K] = \beta \wedge \alpha$ where β is the element $[\mathrm{C}^2_U(K)] = [\mathrm{QC}^2_U(K)]$ of $\mathcal{LC}(G)$. Thus $\theta(\mathcal{LC}(G))$ contains $\mathcal{LD}(G; \alpha)$.

Let $\mathcal{L} = \theta^{-1}(\mathcal{LD}(G; \alpha)) \cap \mathcal{LC}(G)$. Then $\mathcal{L}$ is closed under meets in $\mathcal{LC}(G)$, by the fact that $\perp^2$ is compatible with the meet operation. Furthermore $\mathcal{L}$ is closed under complementation in $\mathcal{LC}(G)$, since the complement of $\beta \wedge \alpha$ in $\mathcal{LD}(G; \alpha)$ is $(\beta \wedge \alpha)^\perp \wedge \alpha$ by Theorem 4.5. Using Lemma 5.3 (ii) we see that

$$(\beta \wedge \alpha)^\perp \wedge \alpha = [\mathrm{C}_A(A \cap B)] = [\mathrm{C}_A(B)] = \beta^\perp \wedge \alpha,$$

where A and B are representatives of α and β respectively that normalise each other. So $\mathcal{L}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{LC}(G)$. $\square$

Theorem I (ii) now follows from Theorem 5.2 together with Proposition 3.14.

Remark 5.4. Each element α of the centraliser lattice has a canonical 'global' representative, namely $\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha^\perp)$. This subgroup contains all locally normal representatives of α, and is itself closed but not necessarily compact.

5.2 Weakly branch actions

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Boolean algebra. Then by the Stone representation theorem, $\mathcal{A}$ defines a **profinite space** (that is, a compact totally disconnected space), the Stone space $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$, whose points are the ultrafilters of $\mathcal{A}$, with clopen subsets corresponding to elements of $\mathcal{A}$. Conversely, given a profinite space $\mathfrak{X}$, the set $\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{X})$ of clopen subsets of $\mathfrak{X}$ form a Boolean algebra. This correspondence produces a natural isomorphism between $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A}))$. In practice we will often find it convenient to abuse notation and treat elements of $\mathcal{A}$ as subsets of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$, identifying $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ with

$$\mathfrak{S}(\alpha) := \{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A}) \mid \alpha \in \mathfrak{p}\} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})).$$

The expressions '$\alpha \in \mathfrak{p}$' and '$\mathfrak{p} \in \alpha$' for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ can therefore be taken to be synonymous. A **partition** $\mathcal{P}$ of $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ is a finite subset of $\mathcal{A}$ such that the join of $\mathcal{P}$ is α and the meet of any two distinct elements of $\mathcal{P}$ is 0; a partition of $\mathcal{A}$ is just a partition of ∞ in $\mathcal{A}$.

Definition 5.5. Let G be a topological group acting on a set Ω. Say that the action of G on Ω is **smooth** if every point stabiliser is open; in other words, for every open compact subgroup U of G, the orbits of U on Ω are all finite. Note that if the action is smooth, then G is orbit-equivalent to any of its dense subgroups.

The following fact shows the relevance of smooth actions for t.d.l.c. groups:

Lemma 5.6. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group, let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a profinite space and $\mathcal{A}$ a Boolean algebra.*

(i) If G acts on $\mathfrak{X}$ by homeomorphisms, and if the G-action is continuous with respect to the topology of uniform convergence, then the corresponding G-action on the Boolean algebra of clopen subsets of $\mathfrak{X}$ is smooth.

(ii) If G acts on $\mathcal{A}$ by automorphisms, and if the G-action is smooth, then the corresponding G-action on the Stone space $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ is continuous with respect to the topology of uniform convergence. In particular, the action map $(g, x) \mapsto gx$ is a continuous map from $G \times \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ to $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. Let $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ and let $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathfrak{X}_n$ be a clopen partition of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$.

If G acts on $\mathfrak{X}$ by homeomorphisms, and if the G-action is continuous with respect to the topology of uniform convergence, then for any net (g_α) converging to the identity in G, for all i and each $x \in \mathfrak{X}_i$, we have $g_\alpha(x) \in \mathfrak{X}_i$ for all sufficiently large

α. Therefore g_α eventually belongs to the common stabiliser $H = \bigcap_{i=1}^n G_{\mathfrak{X}_i}$, which is thus an open subgroup of G. It follows that $U_{\mathfrak{X}_i} = U \cap G_{\mathfrak{X}_i}$ is of finite index in U, so that the U-orbit of $\mathfrak{X}_i$ is finite. Thus (i) holds.

Assume now that G acts smoothly on $\mathcal{A}$ by automorphisms and set $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$. Since the action is smooth, the common stabiliser $V = \bigcap_{i=1}^n U_{\mathfrak{X}_i}$ is open in U. Thus any net (g_α) converging to the identity in G eventually belongs to V and thus stabilises each $\mathfrak{X}_i$. Thus (g_α) uniformly converges to the identity in the space of homeomorphisms of $\mathfrak{X}$. In particular the action of G on $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ is jointly continuous (see [9, Chapter 7]). This proves (ii). ☐

As before, let G be a group acting on a set Ω. Given $X \subseteq \Omega$, the **rigid stabiliser** of X is the subgroup

$$\mathrm{rist}_G(X) := \{g \in G \mid gx = x \text{ for all } x \in \Omega \setminus X\}.$$

Similarly, if G acts on a Boolean algebra $\mathcal{A}$, then given $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ we define

$$\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha) := \{g \in G \mid g\beta = \beta \text{ for all } \beta \leq \alpha^\perp\}.$$

Notice that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ or of $\mathcal{LD}(G)$, then $\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha) \leq \mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha^\perp)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group acting smoothly on a Boolean algebra $\mathcal{A}$ and let $\upsilon \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$. Then $\mathrm{rist}_G(\upsilon)$ is closed.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $G_\mathfrak{p}$ is closed for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$. This is immediate from Lemma 5.6. ☐

Related to the notion of rigid stabilisers is that of **(weakly, locally) branch** actions. The centraliser and local decomposition lattices account for all faithful actions of this kind of a t.d.l.c. group (if any such actions exist).

Definition 5.8. Let G be a t.d.l.c. group acting on a Boolean algebra $\mathcal{A}$ with kernel K. Say the action is **weakly branch** if the action is smooth and if $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)/K$ is non-trivial for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{0\}$. Say the action is **locally branch** if it is weakly branch and if $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha^\perp)$ is open for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. Given an action of G by homeomorphisms on a profinite space $\mathfrak{X}$, we say the action is weakly or locally branch if the action of G on the algebra of clopen subsets of $\mathfrak{X}$ is smooth and weakly or locally branch respectively.

Here are some basic properties of weakly branch and locally branch actions. We state it for actions on profinite spaces; of course the corresponding statements hold for actions on Boolean algebra by the Stone correspondence.

Lemma 5.9. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group acting by homeomorphisms on a profinite space $\mathfrak{X}$ containing more than one point. Assume that the action is weakly branch with kernel K. Then:*

(i) *$\mathfrak{X}$ has no isolated point.*

(ii) *If $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$, then for every non-empty proper clopen set $\alpha \subsetneq \mathfrak{X}$, the quotient $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)/K$ is non-discrete.*

(iii) *For any two clopen subsets α, β, we have $\alpha \neq \beta$ if and only if $[\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)] \neq [\mathrm{rist}_G(\beta)]$.*

Proof. Notice that the G-action on $\mathfrak{X}$ is continuous by Lemma 5.6. Therefore, there is no loss of generality in replacing G by the quotient G/K, where K is the kernel of the action on $\mathfrak{X}$.

(i) If a point $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ is isolated, its complement is a proper clopen set whose rigid stabiliser is trivial. This implies (i).

(ii) Let $\alpha \subsetneq \mathfrak{X}$ be a non-empty clopen subset. Then G_α is open since the G-action is smooth, and contains $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$ as a non-discrete normal subgroup. If the latter were discrete, it would then be contained in $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$ by Lemma 3.2, contradicting the hypothesis that $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$. This proves (ii).

(iii) Assume that $\alpha \neq \beta$. Upon swapping α and β, we may assume that $\alpha \not\leq \beta$. Then $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp)$ is contained in $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$. On the other hand $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp) \cap \mathrm{rist}_G(\beta) = 1$, so $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha) \neq \mathrm{rist}_G(\beta)$. □

We now study the rigid stabilisers of the G-action on the centraliser and local decomposition lattices.

Proposition 5.10. *Let G be a non-discrete t.d.l.c. group. Make one of the following hypotheses:*

(a) *H is a C-stable locally normal subgroup of G such that $G = \mathrm{Comm}_G(H)$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is a G-invariant subalgebra of $\mathcal{LD}(G; H)$ on which G acts faithfully.*

(b) *G is locally C-stable and $\mathcal{A}$ is a G-invariant subalgebra of $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ on which G acts faithfully.*

Then the following hold.

- *(i) For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, we have* $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha) = \mathrm{QC}^2_G(\alpha) = \mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha))$. *Moreover* $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$ *contains each representative $K \in \alpha$.*
- *(ii) For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, the subgroup* $\mathrm{QC}^2_G(\alpha)$ *is a closed.*
- *(iii) For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, we have* $\alpha = [\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)]$.
- *(iv) The action of G on $\mathcal{A}$ is weakly branch, and if $\mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{LD}(G)$ the action is locally branch.*

Proof. First note that the G-action on $\mathcal{A}$ is smooth. Moreover, either hypotheses imply that every element of $\mathcal{A}$ has C-stable representatives: this follows from Lemma 4.1 under hypothgesis (a) and from the definition under (b).

(i) We see that $\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha)$ is contained in $\mathrm{rist}_G(\beta)$, where β is the complement of α in $\mathcal{A}$. In particular, $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$ centralises $\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha)$, so $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha) \leq \mathrm{C}_G(\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha)) \leq \mathrm{QC}^2_G(\alpha)$. On the other hand $\mathrm{QC}^2_G(\alpha)$ commensurates every compact subgroup of $\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha)$, and for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$ such that $\alpha \wedge \gamma = 0$, there is a representative of γ contained in $\mathrm{QC}_G(\alpha)$. Hence $\mathrm{QC}^2_G(\alpha) \leq \mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$. This proves (i).

(ii) Clear from (i) and Lemma 5.7.

(iii) Follows from (i) and Theorem 5.2(ii).

(iv) If is clear from (i) that the action is weakly branch. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{LD}(G)$, note that for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ there are representatives K of α and L of $\alpha^\perp$ such that KL is an open compact subgroup of G. Consequently $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha^\perp)$ is open in G. ☐

For a locally C-stable t.d.l.c. group, the faithful locally or weakly branch actions of G are controlled by $\mathcal{LD}(G)$ and $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ respectively.

Theorem 5.11. *Let G be a locally C-stable t.d.l.c. group.*

- *(i) Every G-equivalence class of faithful weakly branch actions of G (if there are any) occurs as the action of G on a subalgebra of $\mathcal{LC}(G)$.*
- *(ii) Every G-equivalence class of faithful locally branch actions of G (if there are any) occurs as the action of G on a subalgebra of $\mathcal{LD}(G)$.*

Proof. Let U be an open compact subgroup of G and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Boolean algebra equipped with a faithful weakly branch action of G. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $\beta = \alpha^{\perp}$. Then $\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)$ is locally normal since the action of G is smooth. Let $x \in \mathrm{QC}_U(\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha))$. We claim that $x \in \mathrm{rist}_U(\beta)$, in other words, the set υ of points moved by x is a subset of β. If not, then $\upsilon \cap \alpha$ contains some $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}$, since υ is an open subset of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$. Indeed there is some $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $0 < \delta \leq \gamma$ and $x\delta \neq \delta$. The fact that the action is weakly branch ensures that $\mathrm{rist}_U(\delta)$ and $\mathrm{rist}_U(x\delta)$ are not locally equivalent by Lemma 5.9(iii), so x does not commensurate $\mathrm{rist}_U(\delta)$, and in particular $x \notin \mathrm{QC}_U(\mathrm{rist}_U(\delta))$. Since $\mathrm{rist}_U(\delta) \leq \mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)$, we have a contradiction.

Thus we have a map $\theta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{LC}(G)$, given by $\theta(\alpha) = [\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)]$. This map is clearly compatible with the meet operations, and it is injective by the fact that the action of G on $\mathcal{A}$ is weakly branch. To show θ is an embedding of Boolean algebras, it remains to show that $[\mathrm{rist}_U(\beta)] = [\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)]^{\perp}$ where $\beta = \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \alpha$. Certainly $[\mathrm{rist}_U(\beta)] \leq [\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)]^{\perp}$, as $\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)$ and $\mathrm{rist}_U(\beta)$ commute. Conversely, we have already seen that if $x \in U$ centralises an open subgroup of $\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)$, then x lies in the rigid stabiliser of β. Thus $[\mathrm{rist}_U(\beta)] = [\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)]^{\perp}$ as claimed.

Finally, note that if the action of G on $\mathcal{A}$ is locally branch, then $\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha) \times \mathrm{rist}_U(\beta)$ is open, so $\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha)$ is an almost direct factor of U. So in this case $\theta(\mathcal{A})$ is contained in $\mathcal{LD}(G)$. ☐

Proof of Theorem II. (i) This is clear from the definitions and the fact that $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$ contains every representative of α for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{LC}(G)$.

(ii) By Theorem 5.11 (i), there is a G-equivariant embedding ρ of the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of clopen subsets of $\mathfrak{X}$ into $\mathcal{LC}(G)$. This embedding ρ then corresponds, via the contravariant functor provided by the Stone representation theorem, to a G-equivariant quotient map ρ^* from $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{LC}(G))$ to $\mathfrak{X}$. ☐

5.3 A condition ensuring trivial rigid stabilisers

We have seen that if G is locally C-stable and $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ is trivial, then G does not have any faithful weakly branch actions. In fact more can be said in this case about the faithful actions of G on compact spaces.

Definition 5.12. Let G be a t.d.l.c. group. Say G has the **locally normal intersection property** (LNIP) if for any two non-trivial locally normal subgroups K, L of G, the intersection $K \cap L$ is non-trivial.

If G is locally C-stable, one sees that G has LNIP if and only if $\mathcal{LC}(G)$ is trivial.

Let G be a group acting faithfully on a topological space X. Say the action is **locally faithful** at $x \in X$ if for every neighbourhood O of x, the pointwise stabiliser of O in G is trivial.

Proposition 5.13. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group with LNIP such that* $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$, *and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Boolean algebra on which G acts smoothly and faithfully; let $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ with the induced action of G. Then the set of points in $\mathfrak{X}$ at which G acts locally faithfully is non-empty and closed. In particular, if the action of G on $\mathfrak{X}$ is minimal, then* $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha) = 1$ *for all* $\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\infty\}$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{Y}$ be the set of points at which G acts locally faithfully. We see from the definition that $\mathfrak{X} \setminus \mathfrak{Y}$ is open and hence $\mathfrak{X}$ is closed, since if G does not act locally faithfully at some $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}$, then there is an open neighbourhood O of $\mathfrak{p}$ such that the pointwise stabiliser of O is non-trivial, and hence G does not act locally faithfully at any point in O.

Suppose $\mathfrak{Y} = \emptyset$. Then for each $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}$, we can find $\alpha_x \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathfrak{p} \in \alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha^{\perp}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ is non-trivial. Since the action of G on $\mathcal{A}$ is smooth, $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha^{\perp}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ has open normaliser in G; the fact that $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ then forces $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha^{\perp}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ to be non-discrete. Since every point in $\mathfrak{X}$ is covered by some $\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}$, by compactness we have $\bigvee^n_{i=1} \alpha_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = \infty$ for some $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_n \in \mathfrak{X}$. Fix an open compact subgroup U of G. Each of the groups $\mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha^{\perp}_{\mathfrak{p}_i})$ is locally normal and non-trivial, so the intersection $K = \bigcap^n_{i=1} \mathrm{rist}_U(\alpha^{\perp}_{\mathfrak{p}_i})$ is non-trivial, since G has LNIP. But now the fact that $\bigvee^n_{i=1} \alpha_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = \infty$, in other words $\bigwedge^n_{i=1} \alpha^{\perp}_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = 0$, ensures that K acts trivially on $\mathcal{A}$, contradicting the hypothesis that G acts faithfully on $\mathcal{A}$. Hence $\mathfrak{Y}$ must be non-empty.

Clearly $\mathfrak{Y}$ is G-invariant, so if the action of G on $\mathfrak{X}$ is minimal, then $\mathfrak{Y} = \mathfrak{X}$. ☐

6 Some radicals of locally compact groups

6.1 The quasi-hypercentre

In previous sections, we found it useful to assume that the groups under consideration have trivial quasi-centre. Of course, there is no reason in general for a t.d.l.c. group to have this property; more interesting, however, is the question of which locally compact groups G have a non-trivial Hausdorff quotient G/K such that $\mathrm{QZ}(G/K) = 1$.

To address this issue, we need to introduce the following definitions.

Definition 6.1. Let G be a locally compact group. A subgroup K of G is called **quasi-hypercentral** in G if for each closed normal subgroup N of G not containing K, the image of K in G/N intersects $\mathrm{QZ}(G/N)$ non-trivially. The **quasi-hypercentre** of G, denoted by $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$, is the intersection of all closed normal subgroups N of G such that $\mathrm{QZ}(G/N) = 1$.

The main properties of the quasi-hypercentre are collected in the following.

Theorem 6.2. *Let G be a locally compact group. Then:*

(i) $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$ *is a closed characteristic subgroup.*

(ii) The quotient $G/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$ has trivial quasi-centre. In particular $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$ *is the unique minimal closed normal subgroup of G with this property.*

(iii) $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$ *is the unique largest quasi-hypercentral subgroup of G.*

Proof. (i) is clear by the definition of the quasi-hypercentre.

(ii) Set $H = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$ and let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of all closed normal subgroups N of G such that $\mathrm{QZ}(G/N) = 1$. Let $x \in G$, and suppose $xH \in \mathrm{QZ}(G/H)$. For any $N \in \mathcal{N}$, the group G/N is a quotient of G/H, so that $xN \in \mathrm{QZ}(G/N)$ by Lemma 3.2(iii). Since $\mathrm{QZ}(G/N) = 1$ by the definition of $\mathcal{N}$, we infer that $x \in N$. Thus $x \in \bigcap_{N \in \mathcal{N}} N = H$. In other words G/H has trivial quasi-centre, as desired.

(iii) Since $\mathrm{QZ}(G/H) = 1$ by (ii), it follows that every quasi-hypercentral subgroup of G is contained in H. It remains to show that H itself is quasi-hypercentral. Let M be a closed normal subgroup of G not containing H. Then $N = H \cap M$ does not contain H. Therefore, by the definition of H, the quasi-centre of G/N is non-trivial and, hence, there is some element x of G such that $x \notin N$ and $xN \in \mathrm{QZ}(G/N)$. Since $\mathrm{QZ}(G/H) = 1$ by (ii), in fact we have $x \in H \setminus N = H \setminus M$. Since $N \leq M$, the group G/M is a quotient of G/N, and we deduce from Lemma 3.2(iii) that x is an element of H whose image in G/M is non-trivial and contained in $\mathrm{QZ}(G/M)$. We conclude that H is quasi-hypercentral in G, as desired. ☐

Recall that the quasi-centre $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$ is characteristic but need not be closed. Theorem 6.2 ensures that if $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$ is non-trivial, then $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$ is a non-trivial closed characteristic subgroup (that could be the whole of G).

6.2 Relation with the quasi-hypercentre of subgroups

We now specialise to t.d.l.c. groups. The goal is to establish the following stability properties of the quasi-hypercentre by passage to subgroups.

Proposition 6.3. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and H be a subgroup.*

(i) If H is closed and normal, then $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H) \geq \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) \cap H$.

(ii) If H is open, then $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H) = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) \cap H$.

The proof of that proposition requires some preparations and will be given at the end of the subsection. We shall need additional definitions.

Recall that given two normal subgroups $K \geq L$ of an abstract group G, the **centraliser of K modulo L** is defined by

$$\mathrm{C}_G(K/L) = \{g \in G \mid [g, K] \subset L\},$$

where we define $[u, g] = ugu^{-1}g^{-1}$. The centraliser $\mathrm{C}_G(K/L)$ is a normal subgroup of G, since it coincides with the preimage in G of the centraliser $\mathrm{C}_{G/L}(K/L)$. We shall need to quasify this notion as follows.

Definition 6.4. Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let K and L be closed subgroups. The **quasi-centraliser of K modulo L** is defined by

$$\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L) = \{g \in G \mid \text{there is } U \in \mathcal{B}(G) \text{ such that } [g, U \cap K] \subset L.\}$$

The following shows that $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ is a normal subgroup of G provided that L is normal in K and that K and L are both 'quasi-normal' in G:

Lemma 6.5. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let K and L be non-trivial subgroups of G such that $L \trianglelefteq K$. Assume that $gKg^{-1} \in [K]$ and $gLg^{-1} \in [L]$ for all $g \in G$. Then:*

(i) $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L) = \mathrm{QC}_G(K'/L')$ for all $K' \in [K]$ and $L' \in [L]$.

(ii) $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ is a non-trivial normal subgroup of G.

Proof. (i) It is clear from the definition that $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ is invariant under replacing K with a subgroup of G that is locally equivalent to K.

Let $M = V \cap L$ for some open compact subgroup V of G. Certainly $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/M) \subseteq \mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$. On the other hand, given $g \in \mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ and an open compact subgroup U of G such that $[u, g] \in L$ for all $u \in U \cap K$, there is an open subgroup W of V such that $WgWg^{-1}$ is a subset of V. Thus for all $w \in W \cap K$ we have $[w, g] \in V \cap L = M$, so $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/M) = \mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$. Hence $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ is invariant under replacing L with a subgroup of G that is locally equivalent to L. This proves (i).

(ii) We see that $L \leq \mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$, since $[K, L] \leq L$, so $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ is non-trivial.

Let $g, h \in \mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ and let U and V be open compact subgroups of G such that $[u, g] \in L$ for all $u \in U \cap K$ and $[v, h] \in L$ for all $v \in V \cap K$. Then for $u \in U \cap V$ we have

$$[u, g^{-1}h] = ug^{-1}hu^{-1}h^{-1}g = g^{-1}[g, u][u, h]g \in g^{-1}Lg.$$

Since $g^{-1}Lg \in [L]$ by hypothesis, we deduce from (i) that $g^{-1}h \in \mathrm{QC}_G(K/g^{-1}Lg) = \mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$, so $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ is a subgroup of G. By definition, we have

$$g\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)g^{-1} = \mathrm{QC}_G(gKg^{-1}/gLg^{-1})$$

for all $g \in G$. Therefore $\mathrm{QC}_G(K/L)$ is normal in G by (i). $\square$

We note the following fact separately as it will be used again later.

Lemma 6.6. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group. Suppose that to every open compact subgroup U we have assigned a closed normal subgroup $\mathrm{R}(U)$, such that the following statements hold:*

(a) Given two open compact subgroups U and V of G, then $\mathrm{R}(U)$ is commensurate to $\mathrm{R}(V)$.

(b) Given an open compact subgroup U of G, then the quotient $U/\mathrm{R}(U)$ has trivial quasi-centre.

Let $U \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ and set $K = \mathrm{QC}_G(U/\mathrm{R}(U))$. Then:

(i) $K = \mathrm{QC}_G(V/\mathrm{R}(V))$ for any $V \in \mathcal{B}(G)$.

(ii) $K \cap V = \mathrm{R}(V)$ for every $V \in \mathcal{B}(G)$.

(iii) K is a closed normal subgroup of G.

(iv) $\mathrm{QZ}(G/K) = 1$.

Proof. (i) Condition (a) ensures that the set $\{\mathrm{R}(U) \mid U \in \mathcal{B}(G)\}$ lies in a single commensurability class of subgroups of G, so that $\mathrm{R}(U)$ is a locally normal subgroup of G such that $[\mathrm{R}(U)]$ does not depend on U. It follows from Lemma 6.5 that K is normal in G and does not depend on the choice of U. Thus (i) holds.

(ii) By the definition of K, we see that $K \cap U$ consists of those elements of U whose image in $U/\mathrm{R}(U)$ is quasi-central. By condition (b), we thus have $K \cap U = \mathrm{R}(U)$. Hence (ii) follows from (i).

(iii) We have already noted that K is normal in G as a consequence of Lemma 6.5. Since $K \cap U = \mathrm{R}(U)$ is closed in U by (ii), it follows that K is closed in G.

(iv) Let $x \in G$ such that $xK \in \mathrm{QZ}(G/K)$; then x centralises VK/K for some open compact subgroup V of G, but this ensures in turn that $x \in \mathrm{QC}_G(V/\mathrm{R}(V)) = K$ by (ii), so xK is trivial. Hence $\mathrm{QZ}(G/K) = 1$. ☐

Proof of Proposition 6.3. (i) We see that the quasi-hypercentre of a t.d.l.c. group is a characteristic subgroup, so $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)$ is normal in G. Let $K = \mathrm{C}_G(H/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H))$ be the centraliser if H modulo $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)$. Since H and $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)$ are closed normal subgroups of G, so is K. Moreover $K \cap H = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)$, since $H/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)$ has trivial quasi-centre. Consequently the quotient G/K of G has a normal subgroup $HK/K \cong H/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)$ whose quasi-centre is trivial by Theorem 6.2. Since $\mathrm{QZ}(G/K) \cap HK/K \leq \mathrm{QZ}(HK/K) = 1$, we infer that $\mathrm{QZ}(G/K)$ is a normal subgroup of G/K with trivial intersection with HK/K. Therefore HK/K and $\mathrm{QZ}(G/K)$ commute. On the other hand the definition of K implies that HK/K has trivial centraliser in G/K. It follows that $\mathrm{QZ}(G/K) = 1$. Therefore $K \geq \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$, and thus $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H) = K \cap H \geq \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) \cap H$.

(ii) Let $Q = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G)$. Note that $H/(Q \cap H) \cong HQ/Q$, and HQ/Q is an open subgroup of G/Q; thus $\mathrm{QZ}(HQ/Q) \leq \mathrm{QZ}(G/Q) = 1$, so $H/(Q \cap H)$ has trivial quasi-centre. By Theorem 6.2, we conclude that $Q \cap H \geq \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)$.

Combining this with part (i), we see that $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(O) = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) \cap O$ in the case that O is an open normal subgroup of G.

Let now $V \leq U$ be a compact open subgroups of G. Let O be the core of V in U, so that O is an open normal subgroup of both V and U. By the preceding paragraph, we have

$$\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(U) \cap O = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(O) = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V) \cap O.$$

In particular $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(U)$ and $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V)$ are commensurate. This implies that if for all $U, V \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, the groups $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(U)$ and $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V)$ are commensurate.

Define $\mathrm{R}(U) := \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(U)$ for every profinite group U. We have just checked that condition (a) from Lemma 6.6 is satisfied, and so is condition (b) by Theorem 6.2. Hence, given $V \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, the group $K = \mathrm{QC}_G(V/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V))$ is a closed normal subgroup of G that does not depend on the choice of V. Moreover Lemma 6.6 ensures that $\mathrm{QZ}(G/K) = 1$, so $K \geq Q$. Also $K \cap V = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V) \leq Q \cap V$, where the latter containment was observed in the first paragraph above. If follows that Q contains an open subgroup of K, so K/Q is a discrete normal subgroup of G/Q; since $\mathrm{QZ}(G/Q) = 1$, this forces $K = Q$ by Lemma 3.2.

This shows that $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) = \mathrm{QC}_G(V/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V))$ for any open compact subgroup V of G. In particular, if H is any open subgroup of G, we may replace V by $V \cap H$ and deduce that

$$\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) \cap H = \mathrm{QC}_G(V/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V)) \cap H = \mathrm{QC}_H(V/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V)) = \mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H).$$

This confirms (ii). □

Remark 6.7. We have shown that the local equivalence class of the quasi-hypercentre is unchanged by passing to an open subgroup. In particular for any open subgroup H of G and any $V \in \mathcal{B}(H)$, the group $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)$ is locally equivalent to $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V)$, so we have

$$\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) = \mathrm{QC}_G(V/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(V)) = \mathrm{QC}_G(H/\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(H)).$$

Remark 6.8. In general, the quasi-hypercentre of an arbitrary closed subgroup of a t.d.l.c. group bears no relation to that of the group itself. For instance, any profinite group H can be embedded as a closed subgroup of the Cartesian product G of its finite continuous images, in which case $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(G) = G$ since $\mathrm{QZ}(G)$ is dense in G. On the other hand H can be embedded in a semidirect product $K \rtimes H$ (where K is an infinite Cartesian product of copies of the free profinite group on 2 generators, for instance, and H permutes the terms of this product) of such a form that $\mathrm{QZ}^\infty(K \rtimes H) = \mathrm{QZ}(K \rtimes H) = 1$.

6.3 Other radicals

We have seen that locally compact groups admit a unique largest quotient with trivial quasi-centre. In a similar manner, for some classes of profinite group there is a unique largest quotient that has no non-trivial locally normal subgroups in the given class. In particular, a motivation for eliminating virtually abelian locally normal subgroups in this way is the centraliser lattice described in Section 5.1.

Definition 6.9. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of profinite groups. Say $\mathcal{C}$ is **stable** if the following conditions hold:

(a) $\mathcal{C}$ contains all abelian profinite groups, as well as all finite simple groups;

(b) Given a group $U \in \mathcal{C}$ and a closed normal subgroup K of U, then $K \in \mathcal{C}$ and $U/K \in \mathcal{C}$;

(c) Given a profinite group U that is a product of finitely many closed normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroups, then $U \in \mathcal{C}$.

Given a profinite group U, write $\mathcal{C}(U)$ for the closed subgroup generated by all normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroups of U.

Given a stable class $\mathcal{C}$, say a t.d.l.c. group G is **$\mathcal{C}$-semisimple** if $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and the only locally normal subgroup of G belonging to $\mathcal{C}$ is the identity subgroup. For a profinite group U, a subgroup K of U is called **$\mathcal{C}$-regular** in U if for every closed normal subgroup L of U not containing K, the image of K in U/L contains a non-trivial locally normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U/L. For a t.d.l.c. group G and closed subgroup H, say H is **$\mathcal{C}$-regular** in G if $U \cap H$ is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U for all open compact subgroups U of G.

Write [A] for the smallest stable class; note that all groups in this class are virtually nilpotent. Another example of a stable class (within the class of profinite groups) is the class of profinite groups that are topologically generated by pronilpotent normal subgroups and quasisimple subnormal subgroups; for this class $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mathcal{C}(U)$ is the **generalised pro-Fitting subgroup** of U. The regular and semisimple classes associated to this class are discussed in [13].

Here is the main theorem for this section.

Theorem 6.10. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable class of topological groups. Then G has a uniquely defined closed normal subgroup $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G)$, the* ***$\mathcal{C}$-regular radical*** *of G, that is characterised by either of the following properties:*

(i) $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G)$ is the unique largest subgroup of G that is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in G;

(ii) $G/\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G)$ is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple, and given any closed normal subgroup N of G such that G/N is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple, then $N \geq \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G)$.

The proof will be given at the end of the section. The following classical fact is well known.

Lemma 6.11 (Dietzmann's Lemma)**.** *Let G be a group and Σ be a finite subset consisting of torsion elements. If Σ is invariant under conjugation, then $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ is finite.*

Proof. See [6] or [11, p. 154]. ☐

For the remainder of this section, $\mathcal{C}$ is a stable class of profinite groups. We need to check that the local and global definitions of $\mathcal{C}$-regularity are not in conflict; this will be ensured by part (v) of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.12. *Let U be a profinite group.*

(i) Suppose that $\mathcal{C}(U) = 1$. Then U is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of all closed normal subgroups N of U such that U/N is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple, and define $K = \mathrm{R}(U)$ to be the intersection of $\mathcal{N}$. Then U/K is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple.

(iii) Let N be a non-trivial closed normal subgroup of U such that N does not contain any non-trivial closed normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroups of U. Then $U/\mathrm{C}_U(N)$ is a non-trivial $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple image of U.

(iv) Let $V \geq K \geq L$ be closed normal subgroups of U and suppose K is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U. Then L is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U and K is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in V.

(v) Let K be a closed normal subgroup of U, let V be an open subgroup of U and let $L \leq K$ be a closed normal subgroup of U that has finite index in K. Then the following are equivalent: (a) K is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U; (b) L is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U; (c) $K \cap V$ is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in V.

Proof. (i) Let H be a non-trivial finite locally normal subgroup of U. Then by Dietzmann's Lemma (see Lemma 6.11), H is contained in a finite non-trivial normal subgroup K of U; there is then a characteristic subgroup M of K that is a direct power of a finite simple group, so that M is a normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U. Thus the condition $\mathcal{C}(U) = 1$ ensures that every non-trivial locally normal subgroup of U is infinite.

Let H be an infinite locally normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U, and let V be a closed normal subgroup of U of finite index that is contained in $N_U(H)$. By intersecting with V, we may assume $H \leq V$. Let K be the smallest closed normal subgroup of U containing H. Then K is topologically generated by the set of conjugates of H in U, which is a finite set of normal subgroups of K (since $K \leq V$), so K is a normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U, contradicting the assumption that $\mathcal{C}(U) = 1$.

It remains to show that $\mathrm{QZ}(U) = 1$. If not, then there is some open normal subgroup V of U such that $\mathrm{C}_U(V) > 1$. Then $\mathrm{C}_U(V)$ is normal in U, hence infinite, so that $\mathrm{Z}(V) = \mathrm{C}_U(V) \cap V$ is infinite as well. But then $\mathrm{Z}(V)$ is a non-trivial abelian normal subgroup of U, so $1 < \mathrm{Z}(V) \leq \mathcal{C}(U)$, a contradiction.

(ii) We may assume $K = 1$. By (i) it suffices to show that $\mathcal{C}(U) = 1$. Let H be a non-trivial closed normal subgroup of U such that $H \in \mathcal{C}$. Then there is some $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $H \not\leq N$. But then the image of H in U/N is a non-trivial normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup, contradicting that U/N is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple.

(iii) Let $K = \mathrm{C}_U(N)$. We must have $\mathrm{Z}(N) = 1$, since otherwise $\mathrm{Z}(N)$ would be a non-trivial normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U; thus $K \cap N = 1$. As a consequence, U/K has a normal subgroup NK/K isomorphic to N, and in particular $U/K \neq 1$; moreover, $\mathrm{C}_{U/K}(NK/K) = 1$. Let H/K be a non-trivial normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U/K. Then $H/K \cap NK/K$ is non-trivial since NK/K has trivial centraliser. Since $H > K$, we then have $L > 1$ where $L = H \cap N$. Now L is isomorphic to $(H \cap NK)/K$, so L is a normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U contained in N, a contradiction. Thus no such subgroup H/K of U/K exists, so $\mathcal{C}(U/K) = 1$; by part (i), it follows that U/K is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple.

(iv) If L is not $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U, then there is some closed normal subgroup M of U not containing L such that LM/M does not contain any non-trivial closed normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroups of U/M. It follows by part (iii) that there is a closed normal subgroup R of U containing M but not L such that U/R is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple. But then every $\mathcal{C}$-regular closed normal subgroup of U must be contained in R, so K is not $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U. This confirms that L is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U as soon as K is so.

Let N be a closed normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of V that does not contain K, and let R be the core of N in U. Then KR/R contains a non-trivial locally normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup S/R of U/R. Since $S > R$, there is some $u \in U$ such that $S \not\leq uNu^{-1}$. Since $S \leq KR \trianglelefteq U$, we infer that $u^{-1}Su \leq KR \trianglelefteq V$. Thus $u^{-1}SuN/N$ is a non-trivial locally normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of V/N that is contained in KN/N. This confirms that K is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in V.

(v) We have already seen in (iv) that (a) implies (b). In the other direction, suppose that (b) holds and let M be a closed normal subgroup of U that does not contain K. If KM/M is finite, then it certainly contains a non-trivial normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U/M. If KM/M is infinite, then LM/M is also infinite and so contains a non-trivial normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of U/M. Thus (a) and (b) are equivalent.

Given the equivalence of (a) and (b), from now on we may assume $K \leq V$. Suppose K is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in one of U and V. Then K is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in the core W of V in U by (iv). Let Y be either U or V. Given a closed normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup R of Y not containing K, then $K \cap W$ is a normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of W not containing K. It follows that $K(R \cap W)/(R \cap W)$ contains a non-trivial locally normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup

$S/(R \cap W)$ of $W/(R \cap W)$, so KR/R contains the non-trivial locally normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup SR/R of W/R; note that SR/R is also locally normal in Y/R. Thus K is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in Y, so (a) and (c) are equivalent. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 6.10. Assume for the moment that G is profinite.

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of all closed normal subgroups of G such that G/N is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple, and let K be the intersection of $\mathcal{N}$. Then K satisfies property (ii) of the theorem by Lemma 6.12 (ii). It is clear from the construction that K contains every subgroup of G that is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in G.

Let N be a closed normal subgroup of G not containing K. If KN/N is abelian, then it is a locally normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of G/N. If KN/N is non-abelian, let $L = \mathrm{C}_G(KN/N)$ be the centraliser of KN modulo N. Note that L does not contain K, so by the definition of K, the quotient G/L cannot be $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple. It then follows by Lemma 6.12 (iii) that KN/N contains a non-trivial closed normal $\mathcal{C}$-subgroup of G/N. Thus K is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in G.

We have proved the theorem in the profinite case. Now let G be an arbitrary t.d.l.c. group. We have already obtained a $\mathcal{C}$-regular radical for the compact subgroups of G. Moreover, the $\mathcal{C}$-regular radicals of the open compact subgroups lie in a single commensurability class: this is clear from Lemma 6.12 (v) and the fact that the $\mathcal{C}$-regular radical is the unique largest $\mathcal{C}$-regular normal subgroup. Let U be an open compact subgroup of G and define $R = \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G) := \mathrm{QC}_G(U/\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U))$. Then by Lemma 6.6, R is a closed normal subgroup of G that does not depend on the choice of U, such that $\mathrm{QZ}(G/R) = 1$ and $R \cap U = \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U)$.

The open compact subgroups of G/R are of the form UR/R for U an open compact subgroup of G; UR/R is isomorphic to $U/U \cap R = U/\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U)$, so UR/R is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple. Hence G/R is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple; in particular $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G/R) = 1$.

Let N be a closed normal subgroup of G such that G/N is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple. Then by the profinite case of the theorem, we have $N \geq \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U)$ for every open compact subgroup U of G; this ensures that RN/N is a discrete normal subgroup of G/N. But G/N has trivial quasi-centre, so all discrete normal subgroups are trivial. Thus $N \geq R$. We have now shown that property (ii) holds, which is clearly a characterisation of the $\mathcal{C}$-regular radical.

Given an open compact subgroup V of G, then the $V \cap R$ is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in V by the profinite case of the theorem. Hence R is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in G. The fact that G/R is $\mathcal{C}$-semisimple then ensures that R is the largest $\mathcal{C}$-regular closed normal subgroup of G. $\square$

Theorem III now follows immediately from Theorems 6.2 and 6.10.

Theorem 6.10 also has the following consequence:

Corollary 6.13. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group. Then at least one of the following holds:*

(i) G is [A]*-regular;*

(ii) there is a closed characteristic normal subgroup R of G such that G/R is non-discrete and [A]*-semisimple.*

In particular, consider a topologically characteristically simple t.d.l.c. group G. Then G is either [A]-regular or [A]-semisimple.

As in the case of the quasi-hypercentre (see Proposition 6.3), the $\mathcal{C}$-regular radical enjoys stability properties with respect to certain closed subgroups.

Proposition 6.14. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let $\mathcal{C}$ be a stable class of profinite groups.*

(i) Let H be a closed normal subgroup of G. Then $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(H) \geq \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G) \cap H$.

(ii) Let H be an open subgroup of G. Then $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(H) = \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G) \cap H$.

Proof. (i) Let U be an open compact subgroup of G. Then $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U)$ is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in U, so $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U) \cap H$ is $\mathcal{C}$-regular in $U \cap H$ by Lemma 6.12 (iv). Thus $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U) \cap H \leq \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U \cap H)$. At the global level, we have $\mathrm{QC}_H(G/(\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U) \cap H)) = \mathrm{QC}_H(G/\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U))$ since H is normal in G, so $[g,h] \in H$ whenever $g \in G$ and $h \in H$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(H) &= \mathrm{QC}_H(G/\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U \cap H)) \\ &\geq \mathrm{QC}_H(G/(\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U) \cap H)) \\ &= \mathrm{QC}_H(G/\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U)) \\ &= \mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G) \cap H. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) We can obtain both $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(H)$ and $\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(G) \cap H$ as $\mathrm{QC}_H(U/\mathrm{R}_{\mathcal{C}}(U))$, where U is an open compact subgroup of G that is contained in H. ☐

We finish this section by linking it with our previous discussion of locally C-stable t.d.l.c. groups. In particular we strengthen Proposition 3.14.

Proposition 6.15. *Let G be a t.d.l.c. group. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *G is locally C-stable;*

(ii) *we have $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$, and for every locally normal subgroup H of G and open compact subgroup U of G we have $\mathrm{C}_G(H\mathrm{C}_U(H)) = 1$;*

(iii) *we have $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and there are no abelian locally normal subgroups;*

(iv) *G is* [A]*-semisimple.*

Proof. Suppose G is locally C-stable. Then (ii) follows immediately from Lemma 3.15.

Suppose (ii) holds and let H be an abelian locally normal subgroup of G. Let U be any open compact subgroup of G. Then $H \leq \mathrm{C}_G(H\mathrm{C}_U(H)) = 1$.

Suppose (iii) holds. If G is not [A]-semisimple, then there is an open compact subgroup U of G such that U has a non-trivial normal [A]-subgroup H, by Lemma 6.12 (i). But we see by hypothesis that U has no non-trivial finite or abelian locally normal subgroups, so by the construction of [A], there is no way to obtain a normal [A]-subgroup. Thus G is [A]-semisimple.

Now suppose that G is [A]-semisimple. In particular, $\mathrm{QZ}(G) = 1$ and that there are no non-trivial abelian locally normal subgroups. Let H be a locally normal subgroup of G and let U be an open compact subgroup of G such that $H \trianglelefteq U$ (see Lemma 2.1(iv)). Then

$$\mathrm{QC}_U(H) \cap \mathrm{QC}_U(\mathrm{C}_G(H)) = \mathrm{C}_U(H) \cap \mathrm{C}_U(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$$

by Lemma 3.6, and $\mathrm{C}_U(H) \cap \mathrm{C}_U(\mathrm{C}_G(H)) \leq \mathrm{Z}(\mathrm{C}_U(H)) = 1$ since $\mathrm{C}_U(H)$ is locally normal. Now let V be any open compact subgroup of G. We see that $\mathrm{QC}_V(H) \cap \mathrm{QC}_V(\mathrm{C}_G(H))$ is finite and locally normal, and hence trivial as required. ☐

7 Refinements of the group topology

7.1 The structure lattice and refinements of the group topology

In this section, we investigate the structural significance of fixed points in the action of a t.d.l.c. group G on its structure lattice. Of course, if G has a closed normal subgroup K that is neither discrete nor open, then $[K]$ is a non-trivial fixed point in $\mathcal{LN}(G)$. Especially interesting, however, is the question of whether a compactly generated, topologically simple t.d.l.c. group can have non-trivial fixed points in $\mathcal{LN}(G)$. We shall come back to this question issue in the second paper [5], elaborating on the results of the present chapter. In fact, most results we shall obtain here are for t.d.l.c. groups that are first-countable or σ-compact; it is known (see [8]) that a compactly generated (or even σ-compactly generated) t.d.l.c. group without non-trivial compact normal subgroups is second-countable (and hence also first-countable and σ-compact).

Our first goal is to prove Theorem IV, giving a general connection between the structure lattice and group topologies for first-countable t.d.l.c. groups.

Definition 7.1. Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let μ be a commensurability class (or subset of a commensurability class) of compact subgroups of G. The **localisation** of G at μ is the t.d.l.c. group H, unique up to isomorphism, that admits a continuous embedding $\phi : H \to G$, such that for some (any) $K \in \mu$, $\phi(H) = \mathrm{Comm}_G(K)$ and $\phi^{-1}(K)$ is an open compact subgroup of H. This group topology on H is called the **localised topology** at μ; it is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{(\mu)}$.

Thus, as an abstract group, the localisation of G at μ coincides with $\mathrm{Comm}_G(K)$ so that the localisation of G at μ is nothing but $(\mathrm{Comm}_G(K), \mathcal{T}_{(\mu)})$.

Starting with a t.d.l.c. group G, one sees that the t.d.l.c. groups with the same group structure as G but a finer topology are precisely the groups of the form $(G, \mathcal{T}_{(\mu)})$, where μ is a G-invariant commensurability class of compact subgroups of G. If G is first-countable, we can in fact classify these topological refinements of G using the structure lattice: this is the purpose of Theorem IV.

First we recall a result of Caprace–Monod [4]. Recall that a t.d.l.c. group G is **residually discrete** if the intersection of all open normal subgroups of G is trivial.

Proposition 7.2 ([4] Corollary 4.1)**.** *Let G be a compactly generated t.d.l.c. group. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) G is residually discrete;

(ii) G has a base of neighbourhoods of the identity consisting of subsets that are invariant under conjugation;

(iii) G has a base of neighbourhoods of the identity consisting of open compact normal subgroups.

Corollary 7.3. *Let G be a residually discrete locally compact group and let $x \in G$. Then the open subgroups of G normalised by x form a base of neighbourhoods of the identity.*

Lemma 7.4. *Let U be a first-countable profinite group and let K be a closed subgroup of U. Then U commensurates K if and only if U normalises an open subgroup of K.*

Proof. Certainly, if U normalises an open subgroup of K then U commensurates K. Conversely, suppose U commensurates K. Let μ be the commensurability class of K. Then $U_{(\mu)}$ is residually discrete, so by Corollary 7.3 we have $U = \bigcup\{\mathrm{N}_U(L) \mid L \leq_o K\}$. Now K is first-countable, so it has countably many open subgroups; thus we have expressed U as a union of countably many subgroups, each of which is closed for the given topology on U. By the Baire Category Theorem, at least one of these, say $\mathrm{N}_U(L)$, must be open in U. Thus L has finitely many conjugates in U, and we have $U = \mathrm{Comm}_U(L)$ since L is commensurate with U. Hence $\bigcap_{u \in U} uLu^{-1}$ is a closed subgroup of L of finite index and thus an open subgroup of K. $\square$

Proof of Theorem IV. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the given topology of G and let $\mathcal{T}'$ be a refinement of $\mathcal{T}$ compatible with the group structure. By van Dantzig's theorem, under $\mathcal{T}'$ there is a subgroup K of G that is open and compact; it follows that K is compact under $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, the set of such subgroups forms a commensurability class μ that is invariant under conjugation in G. In particular, given a subgroup U of G that is open and compact under $\mathcal{T}$, then by Lemma 7.4, U normalises a subgroup $L \in \mu$. Thus μ corresponds to an element $\alpha = [L]$ of $\mathcal{LN}(G)$; we have $G = G_\alpha$ since μ is G-invariant, and see that the topology $\mathcal{T}'$ is exactly the topology $\mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)}$.

Conversely, let $\alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$ that is fixed by G. Then G admits a locally compact topological refinement by declaring the representatives of α to be open and compact, in other words, the group $(G, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$, which by definition has the same underlying group structure as G. $\square$

Note that none of the group topologies in Theorem IV are σ-compact, except possibly the original topology of G, since a closed subgroup of a profinite group is either open or of uncountable index.

We can now prove a slightly more general form of Theorem V.

Theorem 7.5. *Let G be a second-countable t.d.l.c. group with trivial quasi-centre. Make one of the following hypotheses:*

(a) There is a C-stable locally normal subgroup H of G such that $H = \mathrm{Comm}_G(H)$ and G acts faithfully on $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{LD}(G; H)$.

(b) G is locally C-stable and and G acts faithfully on $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{LC}(G)$.

Then the topology of G is the coarsest group topology on G that forms a Baire space.

Consequently, the topology of G is the unique σ-compact locally compact topology compatible with the group structure (in particular, it is preserved by every automorphism of G as an abstract group), and the set of all locally compact group topologies of G is in natural bijection with the set of fixed points of G acting on $\mathcal{LN}(G)$ by conjugation.

Proof. Say a subset of G is **Markov-closed** if it is is closed with respect to every Hausdorff group topology of G. Write $\mathcal{T}$ for the original topology of G.

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. Under both hypothesis (a) and hypothesis (b), by Proposition 5.10 we have $[\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)] = \alpha$; moreover, $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$ can be realised as a centraliser of a subgroup of G, so $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$ is Markov-closed. In the action of G on $\mathcal{A}$, the point stabiliser G_α is precisely $\mathrm{N}_G(\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha))$; since $\mathrm{rist}_G(\alpha)$ is Markov-closed, we conclude that G_α is Markov-closed.

Now let $\mathcal{T}'$ be a group topology for G that forms a Baire space. By the previous argument, G_α is closed under $\mathcal{T}'$. Since G is second-countable, we also know that G_α has countable index in G. In any topological group that is a Baire space, closed subgroups of countable index are open as a consequence of the Baire Category Theorem. So $\mathcal{T}'$ is a refinement of the topology $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ generated by $\{gG_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, g \in G\}$.

Since G acts faithfully on $\mathcal{A}$, the topology $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is Hausdorff: given $x, y \in G$ such that $x \neq y$, then $x\alpha \neq y\alpha$ for some α in A, so (xG_α, yG_α) is a separating pair of neighbourhoods for (x, y). Let U be an open compact subgroup of G under $\mathcal{T}$. Then U is compact under $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$, since $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$, and therefore U is closed under $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ since $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is Hausdorff. Hence U is closed under $\mathcal{T}'$, and hence open in $\mathcal{T}'$ since U is of countable index.

We have shown that $\mathcal{T}'$ contains a base of neighbourhoods of the identity in $\mathcal{T}$, namely the set of open compact subgroups. Since $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are group topologies, it follows that $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}'$. Note that the original topology, and indeed every locally compact topology of G, is a Baire space. Thus $\mathcal{T}$ is the coarsest group topology on G that forms a Baire space. The remaining assertions follow by Theorem IV. ☐

7.2 Subgroups abstractly generated by locally normal subgroups

Let G be a locally compact group. Recall that the group $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ of homeomorphic automorphisms carries a natural Hausdorff group topology, called the **Braconnier topology** (see Appendix I in [4]). Basic identity neighbourhoods in $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ are provided by the sets

$$\mathfrak{A}(K,U) = \big\{\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(G) \mid \forall x \in K,\ \alpha(x) \in Ux \text{ and } \alpha^{-1}(x) \in Ux\big\},$$

where K runs over compact subsets of G and U runs over identity neighbourhoods of G. In particular, for each compact open subgroup $U < G$, the stabiliser $\{\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(G) \mid \alpha(U) = U\}$ is an identity neighbourhood in $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$.

Lemma 7.6. *Let $U_1 > U_2 > \dots$ be a basis of identity neighbourhoods in G consisting of compact open subgroups. Let (α_n) be a sequence in $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n(x) = x$ for all $x \in G$.*

If for each m, there is some n_0 such that $\alpha_n(U_m) = U_m$ for all $n \geq n_0$, then the sequence (α_n) converges to the identity with respect to the Braconnier topology.

Proof. Let $K \subset G$ be a compact subset and $U < G$ an identity neighbourhood. Choose $U_m \subset U$. We can find a finite subset $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subset K$ such that $K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_m x_i$. Since (α_n) converges pointwise to the identity, so does the sequence (α_n^{-1}). Hence we may find n_0 such that $\alpha_n(x_i) \in U_m x_i$ and $\alpha_n^{-1}(x_i) \in U_m x_i$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

Let now $x \in K$. Choose i such that $U_m x = U_m x_i$. Thus we have

$$\alpha_n(x) \in \alpha_n(U_m x) = \alpha_n(U_m x_i) = U_m \alpha_n(x_i) = U_m x_i = U_m x.$$

Similarly, we get $\alpha_n^{-1}(x) \in U_m x$. This shows that α_n belongs to $\mathfrak{A}(K, U_m) \subset \mathfrak{A}(K,U)$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Thus (α_n) converges to the identity with respect to the Braconnier topology. $\square$

In what follows, automorphism groups of locally compact groups will always be implicitly endowed with the Braconnier topology.

Definition 7.7. Let G be a t.d.l.c. group and let $\alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$. Define the **locally normal closure** $\mathrm{LN}(G,\alpha)$ of α in G to be the group generated by all locally normal representatives of α.

We remark that if α is fixed by G, then $\mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha)$ is a normal subgroup of G, which is not necessarily closed.

Proposition 7.8. *Let G be a first-countable t.d.l.c. group and let α be a fixed point of G in $\mathcal{LN}(G)$. Let $D = \mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha)$. Then the natural homomorphism $G \to \mathrm{Aut}(D, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$ induced by the G-action by conjugation is continuous.*

Proof. Since G commensurates the open compact subgroups of $(D, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$, it follows that the homomorphism $\varphi\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(D, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$ induced by the conjugation action indeed takes its values in the group of homeomorphic automorphisms of $(D, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$. Let $(g_n) \subset G$ be a sequence converging to the identity in G.

Let us first show that $\varphi(g_n)$ converges pointwise to the trivial automorphism. Let $x \in D$. Let $L_1, \dots, L_k$ be locally normal representatives of α such that $x \in L_1 L_2 \dots L_k$. Then the group $\bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathrm{N}_G(L_i)$ is open in G, and therefore contains g_n for all sufficiently large n. In particular, for such a large n, we have $\varphi(g_n).x = g_n x g_n^{-1} \in L_1 L_2 \dots L_k$. The latter product being compact with respect to the localised topology $\mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)}$, it follows that the sequence of commutators $(g_n x g_n^{-1} x^{-1})$ is bounded in $(D, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$. Therefore, all we need to show is that 1 is its only accumulation point. Suppose for a contradiction that some subsequence $([g_{f(n)}, x])$ converges to $z \neq 1$. Choose a locally normal representative L of α which is sufficiently small so that $z \not\in L$. We have $[g_{f(n)}, x] \in Lz$ for all large n. In particular $[g_{f(n)}, x] \in Oz$, where O is any open compact subgroup of G containing $\mathrm{N}_G(L)$. Since z has non-trivial image in $\mathrm{N}_G(L)/L$, we may choose O small enough so that it does not contain z. Then O and Oz are disjoint so that $[g_{f(n)}, x] \not\in O$ for all large n. Since O is open subgroup of G, we deduce that $[g_{f(n)}, x]$ does not converge to the identity in G, which is absurd.

Let now U be an open compact subgroup of $\mathrm{N}_G(L)$. Let $U = U_0 > U_1 > \dots$ be a basis of identity neighbourhoods of G consisting of open compact subgroups. Then the groups $L_m = L \cap U_m$ form a basis of identity neighbourhoods in $(D, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$. Clearly, for each $m \geq 0$, we have $g_n \in \mathrm{N}_G(L_m)$ for all sufficiently large n. Lemma 7.6 now implies that $\varphi(g_n)$ converges to the identity with respect to the Braconnier topology. ☐

Corollary 7.9. *Let G be a first-countable t.d.l.c. group, and let α be a fixed point of G in $\mathcal{LN}(G)$. Let D be an abstract normal subgroup of G generated by locally normal representatives of α, and let $H = \Gamma.D$ where Γ is a discrete normal subgroup of G. Then the natural homomorphism $G \to \mathrm{Aut}(H, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$ induced by the G-action by conjugation is continuous.*

Proof. Note that Γ is a discrete normal subgroup of $(H, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$, and we have $H = \Gamma.D$. Note also that D is an open subgroup of $\mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha)$ with respect to the localised topology $\mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)}$, so the Braconnier topology on $\mathrm{Aut}(D, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$ is compatible with the Braconnier topology on $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha), \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$.

Let (g_n) be a sequence tending to the identity in G; let $K \subset H$ be $\mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)}$-compact and $V \leq H$ be a $\mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)}$- compact open subgroup. We need to show that $[g_n, K] \cup [g_n^{-1}, K]$ is contained in V for all sufficiently large n. Since $H = \Gamma.D$, it suffices to deal with the case when $K = \gamma C$ with $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $C \subset D$ is $\mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)}$-compact. For n large enough, we have $[g_n, \gamma] = 1$ since Γ is contained in the quasi-center of G. Therefore $[g_n, \gamma C] = \gamma[g_n, C]\gamma^{-1}$. Remark that $W = \gamma^{-1}V\gamma$ is a compact open subgroup of $(H, \mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)})$. By Proposition 7.8, we have $[g_n, C] \subset W$ for all sufficiently large n. Hence $[g_n, \gamma C] \subset V$ for all large n. The argument with g_n^{-1} instead of g_n is similar. ☐

Remark that, in general, a compact subgroup of a t.d.l.c. group that is commensurate to a locally normal subgroup need not itself be locally normal. For example, if G has trivial quasi-centre, then the only finite locally normal subgroup is the trivial one, but G may still have non-trivial finite subgroups. Proposition 7.8 leads to an interesting criterion for compact subgroups to be locally normal.

Proposition 7.10. *Let G be a first-countable t.d.l.c. group and let $\alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$. Let L be a compact subgroup of G such that $[L] = \alpha$. Then L is locally normal in G if and only if $L \leq \mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha)$.*

Proof. If L is locally normal, then $L \leq \mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha)$ by definition.

Assume conversely that $L \leq \mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha)$. Since G_α is open, it follows that a subgroup of G contained in G_α is locally normal in G if and only if it is locally normal in G_α. Moreover, every locally normal representative of α is contained in G_α. Thus we have $\mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha) = \mathrm{LN}(G_\alpha, \alpha)$, and there is no loss of generality in assuming that $G = G_\alpha$.

Let D be the group $\mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha)$ equipped with the localised topology $\mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)}$. Note that L is compact with respect to $\mathcal{T}_{(\alpha)}$. Thus L is an open compact subgroup of D. In particular the collection $\mathfrak{A}(L, L)$ of automorphisms of D which stabilise L is an identity neighbourhood with respect to the Braconnier topology on $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$. Since the natural map $G \to \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ is continuous by Proposition 7.8, there must be an open subgroup of G that normalises L. ☐

If U is an open compact subgroup of G that fixes α, there is a useful description of $\mathrm{LN}(G, \alpha) \cap U$.

Proposition 7.11. *Let G be a first-countable t.d.l.c. group, let $\alpha \in \mathcal{LN}(G)$ and let U be an open compact subgroup of G such that U fixes α. Let L be a closed* *subgroup of U such that $[L] \leq \alpha$. Then $L \leq \mathrm{LN}(G,\alpha)$ if and only if there is a closed normal subgroup M of U such that $L \leq M$ and $[M] = \alpha$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.4, there is a normal subgroup N of U such that $[N] = \alpha$; by definition, $N \leq \mathrm{LN}(G,\alpha)$.

Let L be a closed subgroup of U such that $[L] \leq \alpha$. Suppose $L \leq \mathrm{LN}(G,\alpha)$. By replacing L with LN we may assume $N \leq L$. By Proposition 7.10, L is locally normal in G. In particular, L/N is a finite locally normal subgroup of U/N, so $\mathrm{N}_{U/N}(L/N)$ has finite index in U/N, and hence $\mathrm{C}_{U/N}(L/N)$ has finite index in U/N. Now by Dietzmann's Lemma (see Lemma 6.11), it follows that the normal closure M/N of L/N in U/N is finite and hence closed, so M is a closed normal subgroup of U such that $[M] = \alpha$. ☐

Corollary 7.12. *Let U be a first-countable profinite group and let L be a closed subgroup. Assume that L is commensurated and locally normal in U. Then the abstract normal closure of L in U is closed, and contains L as a finite index subgroup.*

Proof. Let N be the abstract normal closure of L. Since $\alpha = [L]$ is fixed by G by hypothesis, we have $N \leq \mathrm{LN}(G,\alpha)$. The previous proposition therefore implies that α has a representative M that is normal in U and contains L. Thus M is closed, the index of L in M is finite and we have $L \leq N \leq M$. Therefore N is closed and contains L as a finite index subgroup. ☐

8 Some remarks on groups with commensurated subgroups

Much of the machinery we have developed so far for t.d.l.c. groups also applies in the *a priori* more general setting of **Hecke pairs** (G,K), that is, a group G together with a subgroup K such that $G = \mathrm{Comm}_G(K)$. (For simplicity, let us restrict to the case when K is residually finite; it certainly will be, for instance, if it does not contain any non-trivial normal subgroups of G.) Say a Hecke pair (G,K) is **proper** if $|G : K|$ and K are both infinite. The methods can be reapplied in two ways: One approach is to use definitions that make no reference to topology, and derive results from these; another is to embed the abstract group G as a dense subgroup of a t.d.l.c. group Γ, so that the closure of K in Γ is open and compact.

As an example of the first approach, one could define the abstract (i.e. non-topological) structure lattice as follows:

Definition 8.1. Let (G, K) be a Hecke pair. Say two subgroups L and M of G are **K-equivalent** if there is a subgroup K_2 of K of finite index such that $L \cap K_2 = M \cap K_2$. Say a subgroup L of G is **K-locally normal** if $|L : K \cap L|$ and $|K : \mathrm{N}_K(L)|$ are both finite. Define the **structure lattice** $\mathcal{LN}(G, K)$ of G relative to K to be the set of K-equivalence classes of K-locally normal subgroups of G, with order induced by the inclusion order. This forms a lattice: given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{LN}(G, K)$, the greatest lower bound of α and β is $[L \cap M]$ where L and M are any representatives of α and β respectively, while the least upper bound is $[LM]$ where L and M are representatives chosen to normalise each other.

For the second approach, there is a canonical embedding of G in a t.d.l.c. group $\hat{G}_K$ with the properties we are seeking; see for instance [2] or [14]. There is then an induced lattice homomorphism ϕ from $\mathcal{LN}(G, K)$ to $\mathcal{LN}(\hat{G}_K)$, and one can study G via its action on either lattice. The relationship between $\mathcal{LN}(G, K)$ and $\mathcal{LN}(\hat{G}_K)$ is not straightforward, even in the case that $G = K$. On the one hand, by looking at compact locally normal subgroups of $\hat{G}_K$, we can only detect subgroups of G that are intersections of subgroups commensurate to K; so ϕ is injective in the case that K has a certain separability property (namely, that every locally normal subgroup is an intersection of subgroups of finite index), but not in general. On the other, there may be distinct locally normal subgroups in $\hat{G}_K$ that are not distinguished by their intersection with G: for instance, if we consider the usual embedding of $\mathbf{Z}$ in its profinite completion $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$, then $\mathbf{Z}$ has trivial intersection with each of the Sylow subgroups $\mathbf{Z}_p$ of $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$. Note that $\phi(\mathcal{LN}(G, K))$ is invariant under the action of $\hat{G}_K$ on $\mathcal{LN}(\hat{G}_K)$; indeed, $\hat{G}_K$ has the same orbits as G on $\hat{G}_K$, since G is dense and stabilisers of elements are open.

Under suitable conditions, one could also define local decomposition lattices $\mathcal{LD}(G, K; \alpha)$ and the centraliser lattice $\mathcal{LC}(G, K)$ similarly to $\mathcal{LN}(G, K)$, without recourse to topology, but there is less interest in doing so: any two distinct element of $\mathcal{LN}(G, K)$ that are represented by centralisers will map under ϕ to distinct elements of $\mathcal{LN}(\hat{G}_K)$, since centralisers in a topological group are closed. (In the case of the local decomposition lattice, one finds that $\mathcal{LD}(G, K; [L])$ is contained in $\mathcal{LD}(G, K; [\overline{L}])$.)

Given a Hecke pair (G, K), we may be interested in the actions ρ of a group G on Boolean algebras $\mathcal{A}$, such that K has finite orbits on $\mathcal{A}$. These are also taken care of by the theory of t.d.l.c. groups: we can equip $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{A})$ with the pointwise convergence topology, and then $\overline{\rho(G)}$ is a t.d.l.c. group acting smoothly on $\mathcal{A}$. (In general $\overline{\rho(K)}$ need not be an open subgroup of $\overline{\rho(G)}$, but this poses no real difficulties.) In fact one can easily show that every action of G on $\mathcal{A}$ of this kind factors through a smooth action of $\hat{G}_K$.

References

[1] Y. Barnea, M. Ershov, T. Weigel, Abstract commensurators of profinite groups, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 363 (2011), no. 10, 5381–5417.

[2] V. V. Belyaev, Locally finite groups with a finite nonseparable subgroup (Russian) Sibirsk. Mat. Zh. 34 (1993), no. 2, 23–41, 226, 233. Translation in Siberian Math. J. 34 (1993), no. 2, 218–232 (1994)

[3] M. Burger, Sh. Mozes, Groups acting on trees: from local to global structure, Publ. Math. IHÉS 92 (2000), 113–150.

[4] P-E. Caprace, N. Monod, Decomposing locally compact groups into simple pieces, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 150 Nr. 1 (2011), 97–128.

[5] P-E. Caprace, C. D. Reid and G. A. Willis, Locally normal subgroups of totally disconnected groups; Part 2: compactly generated simple groups. Preprint (2013).

[6] A. P. Dietzmann, On the criteria of non-simplicity of groups. C. R. (Dokl.) Acad. Sci. URSS, n. Ser. 44 (1944), 89–91.

[7] N. Jacobson, Basic algebra. I. Second edition. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1985.

[8] S. Kakutani, K. Kodaira, Über das Haarsche Mass in der lokal bikompakten Gruppe. Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo 20, (1944). 444–450.

[9] J. L. Kelley, General topology. Reprint of the 1955 edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 27. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1975.

[10] L. Kramer, The topology of a semisimple Lie group is essentially unique, Adv. Math. 228 (2011), no. 5, 2623–2633.

[11] A. G. Kurosh, The theory of groups. Translated from the Russian and edited by K. A. Hirsch. Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1960.

[12] R. McCallum, Rigidity of the group topology for p-adic semisimple groups and automorphism groups of trees, preprint, arXiv:1210.1405

[13] C. D. Reid, The generalised Fitting subgroup of a profinite group, to appear in Comm. Alg., arXiv:0904.0424.

[14] C.D. Reid, The profinite completion of a group localised at a subgroup, arXiv:1208.3554.

[15] G. A. Willis, The structure of totally disconnected, locally compact groups. Math. Ann. 300 (1994), no. 2, 341–363.

[16] J. S. Wilson, On Just Infinite Abstract and Profinite Groups, ch. 5 of New Horizons in Pro-p groups, editors M. du Sautoy, D. Segal, A. Shalev, Birkhäuser, 2000.